

Price vol 17

AN
EXAMINATION
OF
Dr. PRICE'S ESSAY

ON THE
POPULATION of ENGLAND and WALES;

AND
THE DOCTRINE OF AN INCREASED POPULATION
IN THIS KINGDOM,

ESTABLISHED BY FACTS.

By the Rev. JOHN HOWLETT, A.B.

TO WHICH IS ADDED AN

A P P E N D I X.

Containing Remarks on Dr. PRICE's Argument of a
decreased Population deduced from the decreased
Produce of the hereditary and temporary Excise.

MAIDSTONE:
PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR BY J. BLAKE; AND SOLD BY
T. PAYNE AND SON, NEWS-GATE, LONDON.

1771



C O N T E N T S.

I NTRODUCTION — —	Page	ix
Plan or Distribution into 3 Parts — —		1

P A R T I.

<i>Examination into the Causes assigned by Dr.</i>		
PRICE for the Depopulation of this Kingdom	2	
Increase of our Army and Navy — —	3	
A devouring Capital too large for the Body that supports it — — — —	4	
The three long and destructive Wars in which we have been involved since the Revolution —	13	
Migrations to our Settlements abroad —	15	
Engrossing of Farms — — — —	23	
Enclosure of Commons, &c. — — — —	29	
High Price of Provisions, &c. — — — —	35	
Increasing Luxury — — — —	36	

P A R T II.

	Page
<i>Examination of the Proofs adduced by Dr. PRICE to establish the Fact of a decreased Population</i>	41
<i>The Proofs stated</i> — — —	ib.
<i>Suspicious Foundation of two of them</i> —	ib.
<i>Statement of the Doctor's Reasoning from the Sur- veyor's Returns</i> — — —	43
<i>Distinction between Families and Houses</i> —	46
<i>Insufficiency of the Doctor's Table for ascertaining their Proportion</i> — — —	47
<i>A proper one for that Purpose</i> — — —	50
<i>Suspicious Appearance of the Surveyor's Returns</i>	52
<i>Returns of Cottages uncertain</i> — — —	53
<i>The Doctor's Reasoning upon it</i> — — —	54
<i>The true Nature of the Returns stated</i> —	56
<i>Table shewing their Deficiency</i> — — —	59
<i>Gradual Decrease</i> — — —	60
<i>Neither any Proof of Depopulation</i> — — —	61
<i>Examination of Doctor PRICE's Argument for Depopulation deduced from the decreased Num- ber of Burials in the London Bills of Mortality.</i>	63
<i>The Supposition of their Decrease not founded in Fact</i> — — — —	64
<i>Fallacy of the Arguments from the new Parishes, and the supposed Decrease of Dissenters</i>	65-7
<i>The Argument deduced from the decreased annual Produce of the Excise</i> — — —	71
	Contrary

CONTENTS.

v

	Page
<i>Contrary Conclusions to be deduced even from the</i>	
<i>Doctor's own Statement of it</i> — —	72
<i>Its Imperfections evinced</i> — —	73
<i>Diminution of the Number of Victuallers</i> —	77
<i>The Ease with which K. WILLIAM raised Troops</i>	ib.

PART III.

<i>Proofs of increased and increasing Population</i>	80
<i>Register evidence applied to ascertain the relative</i>	
<i>Population of London</i> — —	83
<i>Deficiencies of the Bills of Mortality</i> —	84
<i>The several Kinds of Burials not in them</i>	84-93
<i>The total Amount of the London Burials both in</i>	
<i>and out of the Bills</i> — — —	93
<i>Registers of the neighbouring Villages</i> —	96
<i>Of Kent</i> — — — —	98
<i>— Essex</i> — — — —	102
<i>— Sussex</i> — — — —	105
<i>— Surrey</i> — — — —	106
<i>Hants, Wilts, Dorset, Devon, and Cornwall</i>	108-9
<i>Suffolk.</i> — — — —	110
<i>Norfolk.</i> — — — —	114
<i>Middlesex, Northampton, Huntingdon, Cambridge</i>	
<i>Hertford, Leicester, Stafford, Salop, Berks,</i>	
<i>Bucks, Derby and Oxford</i> — —	117-20
<i>Parishes in Wales</i> — — —	121
<i>The Northern Counties of York, Lancaster, Cum-</i>	
<i>berland, and Chester</i> — —	122-4
<i>Register Returns for the Diocese of Chester</i>	125-6
<i>Collective</i>	

	Page
<i>Collective View of the Register Evidence</i>	— 128
<i>Increase of Population during the last 20 Years</i>	130
<i>Comparative View of the Advance of Population</i> <i>in England and France</i>	— — — 134
<i>Present amount of our Population computed</i>	— 137
<i>From the returns of Houses at the Tax-Office</i>	— 138
<i>Table of Returns</i>	— — — 139
<i>Ditto of Persons to a House.</i>	— — — 144
<i>Number of Inhabitants computed from the Militia</i>	147
<i>Conclusion.</i>	— — — 152

✂ Some little improprieties in the arrangement of chapters and Sections, rendered it inconvenient to make any other references than to the parts and pages; which, as it can occasion no difficulty to the reader, it is hoped will be excused.

P R E F A C E.

WHEN two thirds of the materials for the following sheets were collected, and more than half the work actually written, Mr. WALES's *Enquiry into the Population of England and Wales* fell into my hands. That ingenious performance I have read with pleasure, and it has afforded me, in some particulars, no inconsiderable assistance. It does by no means however, (as the author himself seems to acknowledge;) preclude all further prosecution of the subject. And it is a fortunate circumstance, that, as far as we have adopted the same mode of investigation, our researches have been directed to different quarters. By these means we are furnished with an accumulation of evidence for the same purpose; and the near coincidence in the result of our enquiries gives additional weight to the general argument, and mutual confirmation to each other's conclusions.

At

At the same time, I may be allowed to observe, that the plan I have adopted is more comprehensive than that of Mr. WALES; both because I have entered more largely into an examination of Dr. PRICE's system, and have not contented myself with tracing merely the progress of population, but have also endeavoured to ascertain its present actual amount.

E R R A T A.

- P. 42, line last, for 1,319,000 read 1,319,215.
 50—l. 9. column 5, r. 1 to 1,189.
 52—l. 5, for 986481, r. 986482.
 60—l. 8, for of r. or.
 70—l. 20, for 10 r. 20.
 86—l. 2, dele *during 177 years only* 11.
 87—l. 13 and 14, exchange 285 for 365 and vice versa.
 97—for the total 24782-29662-41183-66286,
 12, r. 41183 to 24782.
 100—for the total, l. 18, r. 34594-34610-45712-43338,
 115—l. last dele three.
 116—l. 20, for 11000 r. 1100.
 123—for the total r. 20400-19583-47869-37089. *
 131—l. 9, for *respect* r. *respects*.
 135—l. 9, after *Buxundy* r. *Provence &c*.
 addenda p. 2, dele 1, 2, 3, 4.

* N. B. There are also slight errors in some of the totals of other counties; but as they are too inconsiderable materially to affect the general conclusions, and as they are besides all duly corrected as a foundation for the collective view of the register evidence, p. 128, it is needless to point them out.

A P P E N D I X.

for Examination of, r. Remarks on.
 p. 6, l. 23. over strong beer r. barrels of.

INTRODUCTION.

IT has often been asserted, and not uncommonly asserted to, that the strength of a nation is proportionate to the number of its inhabitants; but this can be no further true than while every other circumstance remains precisely the same. Great-Britain and Ireland, which at most contain not above twelve or fourteen millions, were yet, in the last glorious war, more than a match for the combined powers of France and Spain, which have at least three times that number. Nay, what is greater and more extraordinary still, we seem at this very day to maintain our ground with firmness against the united force of these perfidious enemies, aided by the unnatural alliance of our revolted colonies, and our mercenary neighbours the Dutch.

But whatever may be the advantages that thus amply compensate for our great inferiority in point of numbers; whether they arise from our insular situation, our peculiar form of Government, or that high spirit of liberty so active and vigorous in English breasts; it is still certain, that in given circumstances, our national consequence must be ever in exact proportion to the number of our people. It is, therefore, in a political view, a matter of essential importance, that these do not decrease

decrease. And it must afford very high satisfaction to every one who is really attached to the welfare of his country, or who wishes it to preserve its authority amidst the various powerful states of Europe, to find that general appearances, in almost every part of the kingdom, for 50 or 100 years past, afford the strongest presumption that an increasing population must have been gradually taking place. Our commerce, during this period, has been extending itself into every quarter of the globe; our manufactures have been multiplying and improving to an astonishing degree; our agriculture has been daily receiving additional extent and additional perfection; dreary marshes and barren wastes have been gradually transformed into rich pastures, meadows, and cornfields; small hamlets have grown into considerable villages, and villages have swelled into large and populous towns. Nor have we, mean time, suffered those public calamities, which, in former ages, frequently spread such dreadful devastation among the human species. Neither famine nor pestilence have repeated, in the present century, their periodical visits, which heretofore used to sweep such multitudes to the grave, and desolate both town and country. While, on the other hand, the arts of medicine and surgery have made no inconsiderable advances; and almost every disorder has been so much more skilfully treated than amongst our ancestors, as at once to alleviate the miseries of life, and

INTRODUCTION.

xi

and not uncommonly prolong its duration. Duly considering all these favourable circumstances, men of plain common understandings, would naturally conclude that our population must be greatly increased; and that notwithstanding the little temporary interruptions it may from time to time have received, it must, upon the whole, during the present century, have been a growing and progressive quantity.

But these obvious deductions of unbiassed minds, we have been told, by a writer of acknowledged talents, are mere popular deceptions, and vulgar errors. We have not only heard of *the deserted village* and *the depopulated country* in the fictions of poetry; but have been repeatedly assured, by an able calculator, the Reverend Dr. PRICE, that it is a * clear and indubitable fact that the number of our inhabitants has long been decreasing; that they are now near a quarter less than they were at the revolution; that for the last twenty years, in particular, this decline has been uncommonly rapid, and that the causes thereof still continue to operate with additional force.

This assertion, coming from such a quarter, was, it must be acknowledged, truly alarming, and produced in my mind many a dismal apprehension. I could not but think if this was really the

* Essay on the population of England and Wales, page 18, 23, 25; and Supplement to reversionary payments, 2d edition, page 362, &c.

the case, and matters continued to go on in this accelerated course to destruction, that Great-Britain, so long the admiration and envy of the world, must very soon dwindle into perfect insignificance; and, in 50 or 60 years, must become an uninhabited island, or a mere desolate waste. Reflecting, however, that in matters level to common understandings the most ingenious theorists have sometimes been mistaken, I could not help flattering myself that the present might be an instance of that kind, and therefore determined not to give way to the melancholy impressions, which the perusal of his book had made upon my mind, but to enquire a little more minutely into the subject itself. The result of my enquiries is a strong persuasion that the real fact is directly contrary to the Doctor's assertion; that our population, so far from rapidly declining, has long been greatly advancing, and more especially for 20 or 30 years past. What the evidence and the reasons are which have induced me so totally to differ from a writer of such distinguished eminence, I venture, with respectful deference, to lay before the public; who will judge of their strength or weakness with impartiality and candour, and from whose decision, whether for or against me, I shall have no inclination to appeal.

A N

EXAMINATION

O F

Dr. PRICE's Essay on the Population of ENGLAND AND WALES.

Plan or Distribution of the Subject.

THAT I may not bewilder, either myself, or my readers, on a subject of such vast extent and variety, I propose to observe the following method. I shall first examine into the principal causes assigned by Dr. PRICE for the depopulation of this country; next consider the positive proofs adduced to establish the fact of a great and gradual decrease of our people; and then submit to the reader, what appears to me, the real truth of the case, according to the best information I have been able to obtain.

B

PART

P A R T I.

*Examination into the Causes assigned by
Dr. PRICE for the Depopulation of this
Kingdom.*

WITH regard to the first point, *the causes of depopulation* assigned by the Doctor, they form a long and formidable list, and are as follows, “*the increase of our army and navy, and*
 “*the constant supply of men necessary to keep*
 “*them up;—a devouring capital, too large for*
 “*the body that supports it;—the three long and*
 “*destructive continental wars in which we have*
 “*been involved during the present century;—the*
 “*migrations to our settlements abroad, and, parti-*
 “*cularly, to the East and West Indies;—the en-*
 “*grossing of farms;—the inclosing of commons and*
 “*waste grounds;—the high price of provisions;—*
 “*but above all, the increase of luxury and of our*
 “*public taxes and debts.*”

A slight examination of these particulars will, I presume, be sufficient to make it probable, at least, that most of them are far from being *universally* destructive of population; and that some of them are not *indisputably*, to certain degrees, and in certain situations, actually conducive to it.

S E C T. I.

Increase of our Army and Navy.

WITH respect to the first, "*the increase of our army and navy*," what has it been owing to? Has it not been occasioned by the amazing increase of our commerce, which has required a greater number of hands, both to defend and protect it? If the one has tended to diminish our people, the other has, perhaps, more than equally tended to augment them. Nay it is far from certain, that a large standing army and a numerous shipping, even in themselves considered, and during a time of peace, the only time at present in view, are greatly, if at all, injurious to population. Our soldiers and sailors do not, perhaps, so generally marry, as persons of other occupations, and, therefore, may not be supposed to give so many subjects to the state as they otherwise might. But if they do not marry themselves, they are remotely the cause of marriage in others. They give constant employment, of course constant support and maintenance, to thousands and tens of thousands, who, but for that resource, would be idle or starved. It is, I believe, no extravagant supposition that nearly fifty thousand persons are fed and clothed from our dock yards alone; and I make no doubt but that twice that number are amply provided for in making and preparing the many requisites for our army and navy.

But if *our* naval and military force have greatly increased; have not those of our neighbours done the same? Has not the navy of Russia, in particular, and I might almost say its *army*, received, as it were, its very existence during the present century? Has this depopulated that empire? On the contrary, while it has given birth to commerce, arts, and sciences, to splendor and opulence, has it not likewise prodigiously multiplied its inhabitants, and given them a distinguished place among the powers of Europe? Unfortunate it is if a similar cause has produced so different an effect in Great-Britain! As I do not intend, however, a minute discussion of this topic, I pursue it no further, but proceed to the next assigned cause of depopulation, *a devouring capital, too large for the body that supports it.*

S E C T. II.

A devouring Capital, too large for the Body that supports it.

I Cannot help previously remarking that our author seems here to have fallen into an obvious inconsistency. After having very strenuously

nuously laboured to prove that our metropolis, like the rest of the kingdom, has greatly decreased since the revolution, he assigns, as a still *increasing* cause of depopulation, an over-grown capital; that is to say, a *growing* cause of a diminution of people, *which* cause, in his own opinion, is every day becoming *less* and *less*. This looks so very like a contradiction, that I am strongly tempted to call it so. Left, however, the apparent inconsistency should be really no where but in my own misapprehension, I will slightly consider what we are to understand by a *devouring* capital; and, supposing it actually to exist, what are the natural consequences of it.

When the Doctor asserts then, that our capital is too large for the body that supports it, does he not mean that it contains so many inhabitants, that the rest of the kingdom cannot conveniently supply them with the necessary accommodations of life? Now if this be really the case, I apprehend that this disproportioned animal, (to resume the Doctor's metaphor) would vigorously bestir its hands and feet, and other members, small as they are supposed to be, in order to feed its prodigious head; well knowing that every morsel which entered its mouth would in return distribute nourishment to the whole body, by which it would thrive and grow till it rose to a proper stature, and became perfect, full sized, and well proportioned. In plain

terms, should the city of London to-morrow double its number of inhabitants, we should soon find that the country likewise on every side, for 50 miles round, would receive a proportionable augmentation. The farmer would have double incitement to cultivate and improve his grounds; his products in corn and cattle would every day increase; the tradesman, the manufacturer, the mechanic, would share in the general advantage; great additional numbers, mean time, would be constantly employed in carrying the fruits and riches of the country to the newly augmented metropolis, and in preserving a continual intercourse between them. All around neat and elegant country houses would be taking possession of every pleasant hill or vale; and gay villages would be rising on every side, which would soon become rich and populous. That this is not mere speculation or fancy, the amazing growth of the towns of Liverpool, Manchester, and Birmingham, within these 60 years past, and the correspondent increase, in populousness, beauty, and magnificence, of the towns, villages, and houses in their respective neighbourhoods, are strong presumptive evidence.

But, supposing the event should be otherwise, and that the utmost exertion of the adjacent country should be insufficient to furnish the necessary supplies for this immense capital; what would be

the consequence? Why it would gradually dwindle till it shrunk to a size exactly adequate to its foreign supports. And this indeed suggests the true criterion by which to judge, with certainty, when a capital is overgrown and when not. If the manufactures, the trade, the commerce, the agriculture of a country can readily furnish it with every requisite supply, it is not too large; if the contrary be the case, it undoubtedly is. Hence what is too great a capital in one country, is not so in another. This depends on local and incidental circumstances; the extent of its commerce, the wealth and freedom of its people; the variety of its manufactures; the luxuriance of its soil and state of its cultivation. Thus while England, for instance, maintains its naval superiority, and the river Thames runs through the city of London sending the merchandize of our country round the globe, and bringing back the riches of every quarter of the world, it might, perhaps, increase its numbers to even two millions, not only without detriment to the rest of the kingdom, but even, as above stated, to its advantage. Whereas Paris, on the contrary, standing as it does on a muddy ditch, called the Seine, which is navigated only by a few paltry boats; and the inhabitants of France remaining all the while in a kind of splendid vassalage; half that number may be too great and highly injurious to the general welfare of the people.

Great towns, indeed, in themselves considered, and without relation to their influence on the country around them, are very generally, in some respects, prejudicial to population. Where large numbers are collected together, the air naturally becomes more foul and unwholesome; men are more strongly incited to irregular conduct; to luxury, intemperance, and vice. All these are at once obstructions to marriage, and tend to shorten the lives of individuals. But the former of these evils, may to a considerable degree, be avoided; while the latter is necessarily restrained within certain limitations. The circumstance of unhealthiness may be almost intirely obviated, partly by choice of situation; partly by making the streets wide and strait, and the houses large, spacious, and airy. And as to the matter of irregularity of conduct, it will generally take place after a town is increased to a certain degree, and will make but little further progress; though its inhabitants are greatly multiplied. Divide the city of London into a dozen parts, and remove them into so many different quarters of the kingdom, and you will find, I believe, these separate portions just as virtuous as they are now in the aggregate; just as temperate and innocent, perhaps, as are the people of Bristol, Birmingham, Liverpool, and Manchester.

Dr. PRICE observes, that great “ towns do more
towards

" towards obstructing the increase of mankind. than
 " all plagues, famines, and wars; and that he has
 " often thought, with *pity* and *surprize*, of the zeal
 " with which Sir Wm. PETTY, and after him, Mr.
 " MAITLAND, contended, in opposition to some
 " French writers, for the superiority of London
 " to Paris, or any other city in the world. They
 " did not consider, continues he, that they were
 " only maintaining that England had *a greater evil*
 " in it than any other kingdom."

I cannot help thinking that this remark might
 have been spared. The zeal of those gentlemen
 was, in my conception, natural and laudable.
 They were not ignorant probably, that great towns
 are, in themselves, very frequently *great evils*;
 but they knew also, that they are sometimes indi-
 cations or causes of greater advantages; that they
 are the natural concomitants of overflowing wealth,
 of extensive manufactures, of a wide and flourish-
 ing commerce; that they give life and animation
 to arts and sciences, and diffuse support and main-
 tenance, with all the blessings of industry, far and
 wide; and that if, from the too common licenti-
 ousness of their inhabitants, they are not able of
 themselves always to keep up their numbers, the
 encouragement they give to the adjacent country
 will enable it most amply to supply that de-
 ficiency.

But perhaps it is not necessary to make these
 concessions. Notwithstanding what generally hap-
 pens,

pens, it is by no means incontestably and invariably true that large towns, even in themselves considered, and independent of external consequences, are unavoidably destructive of population. If proper attention were always paid to choice of situation; to public, domestic, and personal cleanliness; to the introduction and circulation of fresh air and some other circumstances, I am inclined to believe that the largest cities, notwithstanding the many disadvantages inseparable from them, might be rendered nearly, if not altogether, as healthy, as the healthiest of country parishes. I am led to this conclusion from some observations upon the diseases and population of the city of Chester, made by the ingenious Dr. HAYGARTH of that place, in the year 1774. According to this writer, the annual proportion of deaths in the six parishes comprehended within the walls of that city, is,

In St. Michael's	1 in 50
———— Olave's	1 in 55
———— Bridget's	1 in 66
———— Martin's	1 in 59
———— Peter's	1 in 61
———— Cathedral	1 in 87

Average 1 in 61

The proportionable number of inhabitants that die annually in some country parishes of distinguished healthiness, is as follows

Pais

Pais de Vaud	1 in 45
Country parishes in Brandenburg	1 in 45
Others in Brandenburg	1 in 50
A country parish in Hampshire for } 90 years	1 in 50
Average	1 in 47½

This account of country parishes is taken from the same writer. They have the original authority of Dr. PRICE himself, and I have called them parishes of distinguished healthiness, because they appear to be more so than the generality of those which have fallen under my own immediate observation; in some of which the annual proportion of deaths on an average of 20 years, is very nearly, thus,

Hunton, in Kent	1 in 45
Boughton	1 in 40
Toppesfield, in Essex	1 in 44
Stisted, in Essex	1 in 36,5
Brightling, in Suffex	1 in 46,8
Eastham, in Cheshire, (on an } average of 14 years)	1 in 44,5
St. Keverne, a village in Cornwall	1 in 40,5

These being country parishes nearly of the same kind, and not greatly differing in size, if we divide the sum of their degrees of mortality by 7, the number of places, it will give as accurate an average, I may safely venture to say as any of those above

abovementioned. The estimates are founded on correct enumerations, and two of them on the medium of different enumerations made at different times in the course of the twenty years. Now this average mortality is about 1 in 42. Consequently, these seven country parishes, most of which are reputed to be extremely healthy, and, in my apprehension, are really so as much as any I know, are, in this respect, almost one third inferior to the city of Chester; which contains more than 14000 people, some of whom are, perhaps, not intirely free from the infection of modern luxury. Here then is *one great town*, at least, that does not seem the *grave* of the human species, nor to check the growth of mankind quite so fast as either *war*, *pestilence*, or *famine*. To what is this owing? If the reader will consult the ingenious observations above alluded to, he may form some probable conjecture. He may too, perhaps, be inclined to doubt, whether if this city were converted into a country parish, it would be much more healthy than it is at present.

S . E . C . T . III.

The three long and destructive Continental Wars in which we have been involved since the Revolution.

THE next cause of depopulation assigned by our author, is, *the three long and destructive continental wars in which we have been involved.*

Now the carnage of war it must be owned, will necessarily diminish the numbers of the contending parties. It may, however, be observed that this is not always injurious to population, in full proportion to the numbers slain, added to those who perish by sickness and military hardships, and the change and variety of climate. We have already remarked the great multitudes employed in making the various instruments of destruction, and the other requisites of armies and navies. And this consideration is of so much importance, that could we suppose the case of a war carried on with perfect security to our manufactures, commerce, and agriculture, instead of diminishing our inhabitants, it would, probably, on the whole, tend to increase them.

However, granting the matter to be otherwise, I see not why our author has assigned the destruction of people occasioned by these continental wars, as either peculiar to *this nation*, or to *this century*.

C

The

The fields of Oudenard, of Blenheim, and of Hochstet; the plains of Minden, and innumerable other places [by sea and land, in almost every quarter of the world, are strong evidence that in two of these wars at least our enemies suffered rather more than we, and yet their numbers, it seems, have notwithstanding greatly increased. But if *foreign continental* wars have so wonderfully depopulated our country, must not *civil and domestic* wars have done so infinitely more? And have not these been few or trifling since the revolution compared with those that so frequently happened before? Did our manufactures, our agriculture, our population, receive so severe a check during any of the wars abovementioned, as in the grand rebellion of the last century, when all was confusion and carnage from one end of the kingdom to the other, and our fields and plains, in almost every county, were drenched in the blood of the bravest of our countrymen? Or what was even that to those incessant scenes of slaughter, of havock and devastation, during the dreadful contests between the houses of York and Lancaster? Can, therefore, the three *continental wars* in which we have been involved since the revolution be mentioned, with any propriety, as causes of *increasing depopulation, peculiar to the present century?*

SECT.

S E C T. IV.

Migrations to our Settlements abroad; and particularly to the East and West Indies.

AS to migrations to our settlements abroad, and particularly to the East and West Indies, the diminution of inhabitants arising from thence is by no means proportionate to the number which actually leave us for that purpose. Those who remain behind have probably more ample means of subsistence. They have stronger encouragements to marriage, and are likely to be rendered better and more useful members of society.

Emigrations to the East and West Indies, in particular, which the Doctor marks as contributing more to depopulate our country than any other, I am inclined to think, on the contrary, have done the least towards it. The hopes of raising a fortune, or obtaining an advantageous establishment, in one of these places, has, perhaps, operated on the minds of the middle ranks of people in the kingdom at large; in the same manner as the prospect of comfortable subsistence from the rising towns of Liverpool, Manchester, and Birmingham has upon the apprehensions of both the middle and lower classes, in their respective neighbourhoods. The peasants and inferior farmers are firmly persuaded that, should they have ever so many children, they shall find ample employment, consequently decent sup-

port and maintenance, from the growing manufactures of those flourishing towns. All fears of a burdensome family are removed, and they form the matrimonial connection as soon as may be. A numerous offspring is the consequence; this is a powerful incitement to the most active industry; and the children are, at length, many of them provided for in the manner which the original reasoning of their Parents taught them to expect, and the remainder gain subsistence from that increased and improved agriculture of the circumjacent country, which has been the natural consequence of its fortunate situation. Whereas had there been no such rising and flourishing towns near these men, they would probably have sunk under the discouragement of their narrow views, and passed their days in a state of celibacy. Of similar influence are the prospects opened to the East and West on the minds of persons of middle and higher rank. A young man of tolerably good education, but slender fortune, is often deterred from marriage by the alarming apprehensions of poverty and distress. He has perhaps no talents for shining at the bar, no abilities or connections to raise him in the church, no relish for the hardships, dangers, and dissipations of the army and navy. If his views, therefore, do not extend beyond the limits of this island, he is in danger of sinking into a very useless and insignificant being. To rescue him from this desponding state, both the Indies spread their

their treasures to his view. He is transported at the idea of sudden opulence; he obtains an appointment to a lucrative post; he eagerly embarks, and safely arrives at the destined port. He is soon admitted to a profitable share in the merchandize of the place. In ten, fifteen, or twenty years, he acquires an affluent fortune, the love of his native country, or the ambition of making a distinguished figure in it, sends him home. He marries a wife, buys an estate, makes a thousand fancied improvements, whether right or wrong, judicious or injudicious, is of no great importance; the industrious poor are employed, the hungry are fed, and the naked clothed; while his house, mean time, is filling with a family of his own. Grant that all adventurers of this kind are not equally fortunate, but that some perish by the way, and that others fall a sacrifice to change of climate; yet if one in three or four return as above described, much more is done for the general advantage and population of the kingdom than if they had staid at home, and spent their time in that torpid state in which they would otherwise most probably have remained.

In conformity to the above observations, I might here remark that the Greek and Roman states were never more flourishing and populous than when their emigrations were most frequent and numerous. And we are assured, in modern times, that those provinces in Spain which send the greatest num-

bers to their South American colonies still remain the fullest of people*. These facts might afford the speculative reasoner a strong presumption that this may likewise have been the case with ourselves; that what has increased the number of mankind in other countries may possibly have done the same in our own. But, unless I am greatly mistaken, I have something more than speculative reasoning to depend upon; I have, I think, nearly *positive proof* that what *occasioned*, at least, *accompanied*, an advance of population amongst the Greeks, Romans, and Spaniards, has *produced*, or been uniformly *attended by*, a similar effect among Britons.

As the kingdom is made up of counties, and counties composed of parishes, I presume it will be readily allowed, that what can be certainly shewn to have taken place in the last, must probably likewise hold good with regard to the two first. This principle admitted, I have no doubt of evincing, to very general satisfaction, that emigrations have been far from depopulating our country. The best evidence

* Mr. EDEN's letters to the Earl of Carlisle, letter 5, page 183. The latter part of the above assertion seems strongly countenanced by Mr. DILLON, in his late travels through Spain, where he tells us, page 5, that the population of that whole kingdom from the year 1768 to 1778 was advanced more than one tenth. And as the Spanish commerce to their southern settlements has been vastly increased during that period, the Spanish emigrations thither most probably have been more numerous than heretofore. As to the Greek and Roman states, they seem to have been one continued series of emigrations from their morning dawn, to their meridian splendor.

evidence in this case are the parish registers; which, where there are no dissenters, exhibit the number of baptisms and burials, and consequently shew, with considerable accuracy, whether there have been any emigrations and how great. If the burials and baptisms are equal, it is to be presumed there have been no emigrations at all; if the baptisms exceed the burials, that excess shews the number of persons that have left the parish; and on the contrary, when the burials are more numerous than the baptisms, the place must have been recruited from some others. Allowing these principles, then, and that this source of information is satisfactory, we may easily judge, from the following short table, whether emigrations have so wonderfully thinned this kingdom of inhabitants as is supposed.

C 4

TABLE

TABLE of the Number of BAPTISMS and BURIALS
in Country Parishes in different and distant Counties
for twenty Years each, at two different Periods, the
former beginning a few Years before or after the
Revolution, the latter between the Years 1749
and 1766.

T A B L E.						
Former Period.			Latter Period.			
Counties.	*Parishes.	Bap.	Bur.	Bap.	Bur.	Emigra.
	Hutton	148	168	238	192	41
	E. Farleigh	201	184	302	229	83
	Boughton	212	113	316	242	74
	Loole	182	144	250	186	64
	Linton	159	157	296	223	73
	Debting	121	119	139	76	63
Kent	Hawkhurst	321	598	778	508	273
	Barming	85	74	118	96	22
	Brabourne	184	137	166	148	18
	Monk's	106	64	100	55	45
	Horton					
	T. Sutton	254	186	265	221	44
	Chart	164	130	192	105	87
	Otham	93	74	155	145	10
Lancast.	Stalmin	528	560	633	462	171
Stafford.	Hanbury	433	472	485	476	9
Essex.	Toppesfield	252	149	339	266	73
Chester.	Eastham	463	380	680	520	160
Totals		4207	3679	5447	4137	1310

We

* Many of these parishes have no dissenters at all; the rest extremely few. The reader is also desired to remember, that, being country parishes, very little part of the different proportion between the baptisms and burials at the two periods is occasioned by any different degree of healthiness.

We here see that in the course of twenty years no less than 1310 persons, nearly the fourth part of the whole, emigrated from these 17 parishes; and yet that the remaining population is still considerably greater than it was 90 years ago (i. e.) computing by the baptisms, one fourth, by the burials, one eighth, and by the joint ratio of both, about one sixth. It is immediately obvious likewise, on the slightest inspection of the table, that, in general, agreeable to the reasoning above adopted, those parishes have had the greatest increase of people from which the emigrations have been most numerous. And, I presume, no one will pretend to affirm that it is a matter of any consequence in the present argument, whether the persons that thus to appear have left their respective places of nativity, went to London, Bristol, or Liverpool; to North America, to the East or West Indies. In each and all the cases, the conclusion in favour of emigrations is precisely the same. In short, mere emigration, in itself considered, proves nothing at all. It will increase or diminish a people according to the cause from whence it proceeds. If it be occasioned by loss of trade, decrease of manufactures, decline of husbandry, and consequently want of employment, depopulation of a country will rapidly follow. If, on the contrary, it arises from extent of foreign possessions, which enlarge the demands for domestic commodities, whether the products of agriculture, or the fabrications of art, it will constantly augment

ment the remaining population, and, perhaps, the more, that under these circumstances go away, the more will still be left behind. I cannot better apply this to the emigrations from our kingdom during the present century, nor can I more clearly illustrate, or more strongly confirm its truth and propriety, than in the words of a writer, whose authority Dr. PRICE will not be disposed to controvert, Dr. BENJAMIN FRANKLIN*. In his thoughts written in the year 1751, *on the peopling of countries*, "there are supposed, says he, to be now upwards of one million of *English* souls in *North America*; and yet, perhaps, there is not one the fewer in Britain, but rather many more, on account of the employment the colonies afford to manufacturers at home. A well regulated nation is like a polypus; take away a limb, its place is soon supplied; cut it in two, and each deficient part shall speedily grow out of the part remaining. Thus, as you may, by dividing, make ten polypuses out of one; you may, of one, make ten nations, equally populous and powerful; or rather, increase a nation tenfold in numbers and strength."

SECT.

* Political, miscellaneous, and philosophical pieces, page 10, printed at London, 1779.

S E C T. V.

Engrossing of Farms.

THE engrossing of farms is the next cause assigned by Dr. PRICE for a diminution of people.

Now this may possibly be productive of that effect in some particular cases, in certain situations, or when carried to an extravagant length; but, in general and as far as usually takes place, I am persuaded, from my own observation in more counties than one, it is far otherwise. That we may proceed with greater clearness and certainty on this subject, I will put a plain intelligible case, and which carries the system of engrossing even further than what commonly happens. Suppose, then, six farms nearly, or quite contiguous to each other; four of 25 pounds a year a piece, with about three fourths arable and the rest pasture. The remaining two 50 pounds a year each, containing 70 or 80 acres of land, and the same proportion of arable and pasture. Let these be first occupied by so many different farmers. A person possessed of more than a hundred and fifty pounds will hardly condescend to take one of the smaller size. Such a man after having furnished his house, laid in his stock, and paid for the previous tillage of the land, has not a farthing to spare. If the soil be hard and rocky, or stiff and heavy, the little team he can afford to keep, two horses at most, is not sufficiently powerful to plough it as it ought

ought to be. He and his next neighbour, therefore, occasionally join their forces. The consequence is that both farms, each in its turn, are unseasonably ploughed and unseasonably sown. Hence a frequent failure of crops. They probably too want money to manure and improve their grounds; which alone could render them productive. Or suppose them not deficient in this respect; yet is their expence, their labour and industry, for the most part, but poorly recompensed; in order to have a due proportion of corn and fallows; or a sufficient variety of products, their fields are small, at most three or four acres a piece. If inclosed, the separations are probably hedges, with perhaps many a large pollard or tall timber tree; these so obstruct the fertilizing rays of the sun, and draw so much of the nutritious qualities of the soil, that, for two or three rods around every field, the land becomes good for but little, and scarcely pays the mere expence of tillage. When harvest arrives, there is about half a crop. During the course of the year, the horses, hogs, cows, and sheep, sensibly feel their master's poverty. You see them stalking about, half starved and like so many skeletons. Hence a strange deficiency in the produce of the dairy; and if the butcher can be persuaded to take any of their half-fed hogs, sheep, or cows, it must be at an under price.

Two of these wretched farmers find employment for one labouring family; and they pass their days
in

in continual drudgery and fatigue; for ever encountering greater difficulties, and greater hardships than persons who have nothing to support them but their daily labour.

With regard to the affair of population, it appears, from the above detail, that there are upon the four smaller farms, six families, four of farmers, and two of labourers; which, upon an average computation, will amount to about 28 or 30 persons.

In the two remaining farms of 50£. each, all the above particulars will be somewhat mended. The farmers will each do their business within themselves; their lands will be more seasonably and more effectually cultivated; every consequence will be more advantageous; while four labourers are constantly employed, and their families, in a great measure, supported and maintained. The number of inhabitants therefore on these two farms will be about 25 or 30 persons; which added to those on the smaller farms, amount, in all, to 55, or 60.

Let us next suppose these several farms in the occupation of a single person. If he has a proper capital, which ought not to be less than 1500 or 2000 pounds, he immediately sets himself to cultivate and improve them to the utmost of which they are capable; stubs up every useless pernicious hedge; enlarges the fields and pastures; drains those that are

are too wet; overflows those that are too dry; fetches manure from every quarter; however distant and however expensive; ploughs, sows, and performs every other part of husbandry, in its proper season, and in the most thorough and effectual manner. When harvest arrives, his crops are plentiful; his barns are filled; stacks arise on every side; and when his corn is threshed, taking advantage of the variety of markets, he sells it for the best price. His cattle, mean time, are numerous and well fed; batten on his highly improved pastures, they every way turn to the best account; are pleasing to the eye, strong for labour, or fat and sleek for slaughter. His dairy shares the general advantage; at once producing greater quantities of cheese and butter, and, perhaps, of superior quality and better flavour. While all these things are going forward, he employs eight or ten, or, as I have sometimes seen in very high degrees of culture and improvement, even 15 married labourers; besides the servants in his own family. So that including the farmer and his household, these labourers and their respective wives and children, there are, in a great degree, maintained and supported from this engrossing mode of cultivation not less than between 60 and 70 persons; whereas in the former separate one there were *at most* not above 60.

But granting that in the former scale of occupation there were really more hands immediately employed

employed upon the several farms, as will certainly sometimes happen; it would by no means prove it more favourable for population than the latter. The engrossing method, as it evidently raises greater quantities of corn, and an increased and improved produce of every kind, must naturally lay the foundation for an encouragement of manufactures, and, consequently, an increase of inhabitants, in other parts of the kingdom.

The engrossing of farms, therefore, so generally and so loudly complained of, while attended with those improvements in agriculture, which it almost always occasions, is so far from being upon the whole, a cause of the depopulation of our country, it is either productive of the contrary effect, or a presumptive evidence that this contrary effect is really taking place in the nation at large.

One very striking consequence, indeed, of the engrossing scheme, and at first sight, not the most pleasing one, is the greater increase of labouring poor, and, in the end, of necessitous and indigent persons. And hence one principal source of that rapid growth of our parish rates, the subject of such common and just complaint. But this, disagreeable and painful as it may be to the tender and feeling heart, in other respects, is, I conceive, highly favourable to an augmentation of the general stock of our people. It is allowed, on every hand, that early and general marriage is of all things most conducive

ducive to this desirable purpose. But amongst whom does this most universally take place? Is it not among the lower and labouring part of mankind? Go into any country town, village, or parish, and who are the unmarried? Who are the maids and batchelors between the ages of twenty and fifty? Are they not of the middle and higher ranks? The number of regularly working people, when compared with their superiors, are, perhaps, three to one; and yet of these latter I think I may venture to affirm, there are almost three times as many single persons, as of the former; consequently the marriages among the lower classes of society are to those among the middle and higher orders, in the proportion of nearly nine to one.* These latter have a certain pride of station; a shame and fear of descending beneath it; a superior, perhaps, a false, refinement of thought; a luxury and delicacy of habit; a tenderness of body and mind, which rendering formidable the prospect of poverty, and thereby checking the impulses of nature, frequently prevent matrimonial connections. The former, on the contrary, having none of these impediments to surmount, readily obey the suggestions of natu-

ral

* Since writing this I have made an actual enumeration of the persons of the different ranks here mentioned, in five or six country parishes, and their proportion to each other, and their relative number of marriages for the last 30 years. From this research, as far as hitherto carried, the labouring poor are to all the superior ranks, nearly as 3 to 1; but their marriages as about 6 to 1. In large towns and villages this difference is probably much greater, and the proportion may be little less than that stated above.

ral constitution, and embrace the first opportunity of an inseparable union with some one of the other sex. They are perfectly regardless of what they may meet with in their passage through their humble walk of life. Let the worst happen that may, it will be nothing more than what they have been enured to in their earlier years. They have already trod the rugged path, and felt its thorns and briars; at all events, those of higher rank, and who have plenty of money, must help them forward, and afford them every necessary support. What, therefore, is apparently the *worst consequence* of engrossing farms, is highly conducive to an increase of people.

S E C T. VI.

Enclosure of Commons and waste Grounds.

ANOTHER assigned cause of depopulation is the enclosure of commons and waste grounds.

This I confess, from the very nature of things and a mere speculative view of the matter, appears to my poor understanding, a most extraordinary paradox. There is in my own neighbourhood a fine heath, consisting of about a thousand acres. In its present uncultivated state, it does not support a single poor family; nor does almost any one receive benefit from it but some of the farmers around, who occasionally

D

turn

turn a few of their cattle upon it. Whereas, were it enclosed well cultivated and improved, it would make six or eight good farms, from seventy to a hundred a year each. These, besides the farmers and their several households, would require near 30 labourers, who, together with their wives and children, added to the tradesmen and mechanics, that would be necessary to supply their respective wants, would raise the population on this single spot, in the course of a very few years, at least, 200 persons. The produce of the ground, mean time, upon an annual average 500 quarters of wheat, 200 of barley or oats, and other things in proportion, would afford provision for an augmentation of people in other places.

These public advantages might be easily obtained without the least degree of private injustice. Whatever benefit any one at present enjoys might be amply compensated by a certain allowance of inclosure secured to him as his peculiar and permanent property. If the poor man's cow has hitherto furnished sustenance to himself and his numerous family; if his geese and poultry help him to pay his rent; if his horse or his ass save him many a weary step as he returns from the labours of the day, in God's name, let him not be plundered of these blessings without an adequate return. But these and every other requisite amends, whether claimed on the foundation of ancient right,

right, or enjoyed only from connivance, may easily be made. A hundred acres, well fenced, secured, and cultivated, would be more than equivalent to every advantage possessed at present; nine tenths, therefore, would still remain clear profit to the public, as well as to numerous private individuals.

Where, indeed, arable land, in consequence of inclosures, is converted into pasturage, depopulation, on that particular spot, must naturally follow. Undoubtedly the tending of sheep and feeding of oxen require much fewer hands, than tilling the ground, threshing and sowing of corn, reaping and gathering into barns. This kind of inclosures, I am informed, has particularly taken place in the counties of Northampton, Leicester, Warwick, Huntingdon, and Buckingham. And there was sort of necessity for it. The soil being extremely wet, it was very little suited to the plough; it was, consequently, miserably cultivated, and its produce proportionably small. Since its tillage has been exchanged for pasture, the intire quantity of food produced by it for the benefit of mankind has been greatly increased. Thousands and tens of thousands have been fed by its beef and mutton more than ever were by its wheat and barley; the landlords have doubled their rents; the farmers have increased in wealth; while the hides, tallow, and wool of their oxen, and sheep have furnished

materials for increasing employment, increasing manufactures, and increasing people in various places. If, therefore, in those particular spots where these inclosures have been made, the number of peasants and labourers has been considerably diminished, and the country parishes deprived of many of their inhabitants; mechanics and artificers have greatly multiplied, and neighbouring towns and villages become rich, large, and populous.

Since writing these remarks I have met with Mr. YOUNG's ingenious publication, *called Political Arithmetic*, which affords, I think, ample satisfaction on this head; and, indeed, whoever will consult that performance will find many just observations, with much judicious reasoning, on the causes and principles of population in general, as well as on other subjects of civil and political importance. The reader I am persuaded, will require no apology for my introducing here part of two pages from this author. They do equal credit to the clearness of his judgement, and the vigour of his fancy; while I flatter myself they are also a striking illustration of what is above advanced, and must carry conviction to every mind that is open to it. " Dr. PRICE, says he, and the other writers
 " who assure us we should throw down our hedges
 " and waste one third of our farms in a barren
 " fallow by way of making beef and mutton cheap,
 will

" will confine themselves to the inclosures which
 " have converted arable to grass. What say they
 " to those that have changed grass to arable?
 " They chuse to be silent. I do not comprehend
 " the amusement that is found in constantly look-
 " ing at those objects which are supposed to be
 " gloomy, and in regularly lamenting the evils
 " that surround us, though they flow from causes
 " which shower down much superior blessings.
 " When I look around me in this country, I
 " think I every where see so great and animating
 " a prospect, that the small specks which may be
 " discerned in the hemisphere, are lost in the
 " brilliancy that surrounds them. I cannot spread
 " a curtain over the illumined scene, and leave
 " nothing to view but the mere shades of so
 " splendid a piece.

" What will these gentlemen say to the inclo-
 " sures in *Norfolk, Suffolk, Nottinghamshire, Derby-*
 " *shire, Lincolnshire, Yorkshire*, and all the northern
 " counties? What say they to the sands of *Suffolk,*
 " *Norfolk*, and *Nottinghamshire*, which yield corn
 " and mutton, and beef, from the force of *inclosure*
 " alone? What say they to the wolds of *York* and
 " *Lincoln* which from barren heaths, at one shilling
 " an acre, are by inclosure alone rendered profita-
 " ble farms? Ask Sir CECIL WRAY if, without in-
 " closure, he would advance his heaths by sanfoin
 " from one shilling an acre to 20? What say they

“ to the vast tracts in the peak of Derby, which
 “ by inclosure alone are changed from black re-
 “ gions of ling to fertile fields covered with cattle?
 “ What say they to the improvement of moor in
 “ the northern counties, where *inclosures alone* have
 “ made those countries smile with culture which
 “ before were dreary as night?”*

All this is strong, perhaps, decisive evidence, in
 favour of inclosures, and I am glad to find that
 the practical good sense of the nation is every day
 so far surmounting the ideal suggestions of specu-
 lation that seldom a session of parliament passes
 without fresh bills being granted for this purpose,
 in some part of the kingdom or other. Provided
 they are fairly obtained, and the several allotments
 of ground equitably and judiciously apportioned,
 I have never yet met with a solid objection to them.
 With these precautions therefore, and under these
 restrictions, I hope and trust they will go on till
 there is scarcely an uninclosed, or waste and barren
 spot, from one extremity of the island to the other;
 but all are converted into fruitful fields, or pas-
 tures, and the whole resembles one large rich and
 variegated garden.

SECT

* Political Arithmetic,—page 149.

S E C T. VI.

High Price of Provisions and the increase of public Debts and Taxes.

AS to the high price of provisions and the increase of the public debts and taxes, they may be causes of depopulation or not, according to their proportion to other things. If they rise remarkably higher than they are among neighbouring nations, they may discourage our husbandry and manufactures; may check our trade and commerce, and thereby probably obstruct the further increase, perhaps, actually diminish the present number of our people. But while the price of provisions rapidly advances likewise *among our neighbours, which every one who has visited them knows to be the case; and whilst they are plunged in debts in full proportion to their resources, *ours* may, perhaps, continue to rise still higher and yet produce no very mischievous consequences as to the purpose in question.

D 4

SECT

* I myself visited France and Flanders in the years 1770, and 1776; and I think I may venture to affirm that the price of provisions, and the expence of travelling in general, in that very short space of time, were increased one fifth. But nothing can be safely built on a foundation so extremely fluctuating. Whoever will consult the accounts at our victualling office will see that the leading and more substantial articles of human food were, on an average of ten years, in the latter end of the reign of Queen Anne and the beginning of that of George the first, as dear as they have ever been since.

S E C T. VII.

Increasing Luxury.

BUT our author seems to lay the greatest stress, on our *increasing luxury*. As he has no where expressly defined the term, and as in the common use of it, there is something extremely vague and indeterminate, it is, perhaps, not absolutely clear what we are to understand by it. If by *luxury* be meant the use of whatever accommodation, convenience, or elegance is beyond the mere necessities of nature, it is certain that there may be various degrees of it, not only without injury; but with great advantage, to society; without impairing either the morals, the health, or the fortune of the individuals that indulge in it, while it affords comfortable support and maintenance to those who are employed in providing its objects. The Doctor mentions as instances of the advanced prevalence of luxury the many splendid houses about London, the great increase of coaches, and the almost doubled consumption of coals. Now surely these are all very harmless things; a man may live in a large commodious house, may adorn it with handsome furniture, may be conveyed in a carriage, instead of going on foot or on horse back; may have a comfortable fire both in his kitchen and parlour, without danger of either shortening his days, or bringing on a single disorder destructive

to the human constitution. Grant that it operates on a few individuals as a check to marriage; to a great majority it certainly furnishes the strongest motives for forming that connection. Grant that a few weak men, from an ambition of aping their superiors, are carried beyond the limits of their fortune, ruin their credit and sink into poverty and wretchedness; on what numbers, mean time, does the fashion of splendid expence bestow substantial benefits? What multitudes of industrious artificers is it warming and clothing and feeding? The carpenter, the mason, the upholsterer, the cabinet-maker, the coach-maker, the painter, the collier, the sailer? If it has not the merit of *charity*, it produces at least some of its beneficial effects, conveyed through the channel of incessant industry.

Let me not here, however, be understood to maintain the pernicious doctrine that *private vices* are *public benefits*. When luxury corrupts the heart, and produces irregularity of conduct, it is highly mischievous to the community. If a man, in the delicacies of eating and drinking, proceeds to excess and intemperance; or if he so gives way to the indulgences of nice accommodation, and elegant refinement as to become slothful and effeminate, utterly incapable of any noble exertion; he is then a contemptible being; wretched in himself, and of little service to his country. But these,
however

however they may disgrace a few individuals among us, are not, I apprehend, the general character of the age. The brutal excesses of gluttony and drunkenness disgraced, perhaps, the manners of our early ancestors; but they are now driven from polite society and confined, in a great degree, to the low and the vulgar. And with regard to effeminate refinement, inactivity, or incapacity for noble and manly exertion, where is the foundation for the charge? When was that high spirit which has so often distinguished the inhabitants of Britain more alive than at present? Have not persons of every rank, almost of every age, capable of lifting a sword, or bearing a musket, readily stepped forth in defence of their country? Have they not eagerly left their private affairs for the public service; and quitted the enjoyments of domestic life, for the tumult of a camp, and the fatigues of military duty? Do not the courage and conduct of our officers by sea and land and *the valour and intrepidity of our soldiers and sailors equal their highest character in any age?* Have not RODNEY, and CORNWALLIS given repeated proofs of skill and judgement, and a cool determined courage which have hardly been exceeded by our greatest commanders in the most splendid periods of our history? Upon the whole, whatever progress luxury may have made amongst us, we have not been presented with any convincing evidence that it has produced very pernicious consequences in the minds

minds and manners of our people at large, or so operated as a check to marriage as to have thinned our country of inhabitants. There seems, indeed, little more truth and accuracy in the Doctor's estimate of our *present* principles and manners, than there was in that *estimate of the principles and manners of the times* given by a celebrated writer at the commencement of the last war who drew a picture of our national character as little consonant to fact as to that high reputation for genius and good sense, which by his former productions he had so justly acquired. He confidently represented us as destitute of every moral and manly principle; as lost in dissipation or devoted to pleasure and amusement; as so enfeebled by luxury and indolence as to be incapable of pursuing with vigour our most favourite objects; as having lost the use of all our limbs, and therefore forced to be conveyed *like helpless infants* from place to place. He maintained that we had neither strength nor courage to defend ourselves; that we must fall at the first attack of our neighbours, and quietly sink into the most wretched and contemptible slavery. The indignant English made no other reply to these groundless imputations, than (as VOLTAIRE, I think, some where expresses it) by immediately beating their enemies in every quarter of the world, and carrying terror and conquest where ever they went. But our present author extends his accusations of luxury even still further. He does not
merely

merely assert that it has deprived us of strength and courage to fight, but even of spirit and resolution, to continue our species. I hope, however, to evince, to a great degree of probability, at least, that we have all the while not only been keeping up our old stock of inhabitants, but actually increasing them as fast as ever.

I have now taken the proposed cursory view of the assigned causes of depopulation; and although I have not attempted to discuss them with that degree of accuracy which would be requisite to give perfect satisfaction; yet there has appeared, I think, in the course of even this slight examination a weight of argument against them fully sufficient to justify our dissent from them, if only supported by mere personal assertion, or speculative reasoning.

But our author, to do him justice, does not pretend to claim our assent on his own personal authority, or mere abstract speculation. He produces what he esteems *clear decisive proofs* of the *fact*, and pronounces them to be altogether as satisfactory as an actual enumeration of the inhabitants of the whole kingdom could be *. What these proofs are and how much to be relied on, let us now proceed to consider.

PART

* Appendix to the essay on the population, &c.—page 38.

P A R T II.

Examination of the Proofs adduced by Dr. PRICE to establish the fact of a decreased population.

THESE proofs we are told are three ; the

- I. Is deduced from the *decreased* number of houses in the returns of the surveyors of the window lights ; the
- II. From the *decreased number* of burials in the London Bills of mortality ; and the
- III. From the *decreased* produce of the hereditary and temporary excise.

All these, it seems, are in such perfect conformity, and so mutually corroborate each other's testimony, that they form together a body of evidence little inferior to mathematical demonstration.

Before I venture to attack these *proofs* in form, I must beg leave to observe, in order to soften a little the formidable appearance they have assumed, that the first and last of them, *the returns of the surveyors*, and the *produce of the excise*, are obviously built on a suspicious foundation. All public accounts, in consequence of the imposition
of

of any public tax, will always be extremely uncertain. There are never wanting a number of persons who are interested to attempt connivance and concealment. Orders are accordingly no sooner issued for a general return to be made on such occasions, than the wise heads of every parish are immediately laid together, how best to evade and defeat the intention of the legislature, whatsoever that may be.

Nor let it be said that this will equally take place, at every period, and that consequently, the deception must be as great at one time as at another. For it is, on the contrary, a fair presumption that it will gradually increase with increasing taxes; the motives for this species of cunning are thereby strengthened and multiplied, and, therefore, allowing the same degree of virtue and morality in the conduct of men, the operation of these motives must be proportionably advanced.

Having made these general remarks let us now come to an examination of the particular pretended proofs. The first is deduced from the surveyors' returns. That this argument may appear in its full force I will here place it before the reader, according to the Doctor's own statement.

Total number of houses in England and Wales from the hearth book, } 1,319,000
in the year 1690,

Number

NUMBER OF HOUSES IN ENGLAND AND
WALES IN 1759, 61, AND 77, FROM THE
RETURNS OF THE SURVEYORS OF THE HOUSE
AND WINDOW DUTIES.

	In 1759	In 1761	In 1777
Houses charged	679,149	678,915	682,077
Uninhabited Houses	24,904	25,628	19,396
Houses excused on account of poverty	282,429	276,149	251,261
Total	986,482	980,692	952,734

According to this statement the whole of the
Doctor's reasoning in all its essential parts, stands
thus.

In the year 1690 the number of houses in the kingdom was	}	1,319,215
Of people at five to a house	—	6,596,075
In the year 1759, that is 70 years af- ter, the number of houses was only	}	986,482
Of people,	—	4,932,410
Decrease of houses	—	332,733
Of people	—	1,663,665
Two years after, i. e. in 1761, the number of houses was no more than	}	980,692
Of people	—	4,903,460
Further decrease of houses	—	5,790
Of people	—	28,950
In the year 1777 the number of houses was reduced to	}	952,734
		Of

Of people to ——— ——— ——— 1,763,670

Still further decrease of houses ——— 27,958

Of people ——— ——— ——— 139,790

Total decrease from 1690 to 1777 } 366,481
(both inclusive) of houses

Of people ——— ——— ——— 1,832,405

The substance of these several deductions is, that, in the first seventy years of these periods, the decrease of our people was more than a million and a half; and in the next eighteen years a further gradual decrease to the amount of almost a hundred and seventy thousand more; and in the whole 89 years a decrease of more than a million and eight hundred thousand persons; or considerable more than one fourth part of the whole. If we allow only $\frac{1}{4}$ to a house, the number of individuals in each period respectively would indeed be considerably less, yet, as the general proportions would still remain the same, and the essence of the argument continue unaltered, I make no other allowance than that of *five to a house*; which, I am likewise strongly persuaded, notwithstanding what the Doctor has asserted to the contrary, is by no means too great an average for *English* houses, whatever it may be for *Dutch, Swiss, French and Sicilian*, so strangely intermingled with them, when the sole purpose was to ascertain a proportion for our own country only, and not any foreign one whatever.

From

From a fair and attentive consideration of the accounts for the several periods as stated above, I am fully convinced that the reasoning founded upon them is every where erroneous; that some of the accounts themselves are improperly introduced at all, and others manifestly inconsistent with the conclusion of the whole.

With regard to the number of houses in 1690, according to the returns in the hearth books, Mr. EDEN, in my apprehension, has shewn, with great appearance of probability at least, that by *houses* was meant, not the *buildings* that people lived in, but the *families* contained in them. He has clearly evinced, by passages from Dr. DAVENANT's book, where he is expressly reasoning upon this subject, and from which the above account was taken, and not from the official hearth books, that he uses the words *houses* and *families* as synonymous terms, and without any other reason for the choice of the one or the other, but the mere variation of phrase. And indeed this promiscuous usage of the two words I am fully convinced by several letters I have received during my present enquiries, is, in some counties, extremely common to this very day.

Mr. EDEN further observes that this construction of DAVENANT's words is countenanced by the actual produce of the hearth tax, from which the account itself was extracted. Nay, as he very
E justly

justly observes, the very table itself shews that Dr. DAVENANT must have meant *families* and not the buildings which they inhabited. For according to this return there were in the kingdom in the year 1690, 1,319,215 houses, and 2,563,517 hearths. Under Dr. PRICE's construction of the word *houses* there are less than two *fire hearths* or *stoves* to every dwelling-house in the whole kingdom, a thing utterly incredible, as there is scarcely even a cottage, or at most not one in 500, that has not at least two hearths.

Now if Dr. DAVENANT by the word *houses* meant *families* and not the *buildings* themselves, it is evident that the number of inhabitants calculated from his return must be less than Dr. PRICE has made them; because there is frequently more than one family to a house, and upon an average the number in a *family* is undoubtedly less than the number in a *house*.

This reasoning, however, Dr. PRICE does not admit; for he tells us Dr. DAVENANT considered the number of *houses* and the number of *families* as so nearly the same that he did not think it necessary to distinguish between them. I am unwilling to believe that DAVENANT was under this mistake. According to all the observations I have yet been able to make the difference is very considerable. Dr. PRICE, indeed, has produced, p. 6, of his essay, a long list of towns and parishes

to prove the near equality between them; but I must take the liberty to observe that of the 38 articles which he has given us, only three are directly to the purpose; that of the town of Nottingham, the parish of Manchester, and the town of Liverpool; and, unfortunately, these are full and strong against him. In Nottingham the difference between *houses* and *families* is more than a *twelfth*, in Manchester near a *twentieth*, and in Liverpool more than a *fifth*. An average formed from a conjunction of all three is above one *eighth*; which, assumed as an average for the whole kingdom, would make a difference of seven or eight hundred thousand people; a number surely of some consequence.

As to the remaining articles of this table, 35 in number; some in themselves, and the rest from the partial manner in which they are stated, are, with respect to the fact to be ascertained, absolutely useless. In one part of them he has given us the number of persons in a *house*, without telling us how many there were in a *family*; in another we have the number in a *family*, but are not informed how many there were in a *house*. From this partial statement nothing can be concluded with certainty. As the numbers, however, in *families* and *houses* often appear near an equality, the only probable deduction is, that these words *houses* and *families* were used, by those that gave

the information, promiscuously to signify one and the same thing ; that what are called *families* in one place, are deemed *houses* in another, and so reciprocally with regard to most, if not all, of them.

What thus appears on the very face of the table, to be extremely *probable* ; I beg leave to assure the Doctor is the real fact, with respect to all those places from which I have yet received authentic information, which are no inconsiderable part of the whole. I will mention only one, the town of Bolton in the county of Lancaster. In the Doctor's table there appears to be only $4\frac{1}{2}$ to a *house* in this crowded manufacturing town. I have good authority to believe there are more than *six*. A letter now in my hands assures me that the inhabitants are really so thick that it is no uncommon thing for one family to live in the *cellar*, and another in the *garret* ; and I leave the reader to guess whether the intermediate apartments are uninhabited.

In short, wherever in the Doctor's table there appears less than *five* to a *house*, there the word *house*, (as far I have yet been able to discover) signifies *family*.

Another part of this catalogue, consists of accounts from foreign countries, as Holland, France, Switzerland, Sicily ; but why these are introduced

in

in a table professedly intended as a ground to estimate the proportion between *English* houses and families I cannot conceive. One thing however, is strikingly obvious in them. The average number of persons in the *houses* and *families* of these countries respectively, Holland in particular, is considerably smaller than among ourselves; and it consequently proves, with at least a strong degree of presumptive probability, that the *English* are more prolific and England more populous, than any of those places.

“ Any communications the Doctor informs us, pag. 82, will be received with gratitude which may enable him to form a more perfect table of this kind.” I will endeavour to oblige him. The following table is formed, partly from the only pertinent part of his own, partly from the obliging communications of friends, partly from my own immediate researches, and partly from a table of a similar kind in a pamphlet lately published by the ingenious Mr. WALES.

**TABLE SHEWING THE PROPORTION BETWEEN
ENGLISH HOUSES AND FAMILIES.**

T A B L E.

<i>Counties.</i>	<i>Parishes.</i>	<i>Hou.</i>	<i>Fam.</i>	<i>Proportion</i>
Cumberland	Carlisle	891	1,605	1 to 1,8
Nottingham	Nottingham	3,267	3,556	1 to 1,088
Lancaster	Manchester } parish }	2,412	2,525	1 to 1,046
	Liverpool	6,340	8,002	1 to 1,088
Chester	Chester	2,883	3,428	
Essex	Toppesfield	105	129	1 to 1,228
	Stebbing	200	212	1 to 1,06
	High Roding	63	79	1 to 1,254
Kent	Maidstone	1,196	1,276	1 to 1,153
	East Malling	175	186	1 to 1,006
	Boughton	87	102	1 to 1,173
	Addington	29	33	1 to 1,013
	Hunton	71	82	1 to 1,154
	Otham	37	50	1 to 1,351
	Tunstall	17	20	1 to 1,017
Suffolk from } Mr. WALES }	Haverhill	146	220	1 to 1,506
	Hawston	50	60	5 to 6
	Blythford	21	30	1 to 1,428
	Sotherton	62	82	1 to 1,258
	Spexhall	15	22	1 to 1,466
	Bramfield	41	66	1 to 1,609
	Henham	24	30	1 to 1,250
	Helton	15	17	1 to 1,133
	Swelland	21	29	1 to 1,380
	Tuddenham	27	43	1 to 1,592
	Wangford	47	63	1 to 1,340
	Wenhaston	56	87	1 to 1,553
	Waterfield	24	41	1 to 1,708
	Westhall	45	61	1 to 1,355
	Wissett	38	54	1 to 1,421
	Witnesham	50	78	1 to 1,560

Average proportion 7 to 8

It is evident from this table that the difference between the number of *houses* and *families* is much greater in country parishes than in large towns. In the former the proportion is often 3 to 4, and 2 to 3. Could we therefore have obtained as many country houses, as of those of towns; the average proportion would probably have been at least as 5 to 6.

At the æra of the revolution the disparity was, perhaps, considerably less. I will suppose the proportion to have been only what appears in the table as 7 to 8. Apply this to Dr. DAVENANT's account, and, supposing that by the word *houses* he meant *families*, as is upon the whole most probable, it will reduce the number of inhabitants at that period to about 5,771566.

But were we to admit at once the accuracy of DAVENANT's account, and that by the word *houses*, he really intended not *families* but the *buildings* that men lived in, and consequently that our people were six millions, or even six millions and a half; I have no doubt of adding so much to the returns of the last period (i. e.) between 1750 and 78, as amply to counterbalance those of the former period. And that we may proceed in these returns with the more ease and clearness, I beg leave once more to place them immediately under the eye of the reader as stated by our author:

Houses

Houses returned charged	in 1759	in 61	in 77
uninhabited	679,149	678,915	682,077
excused on account of poverty	24,904	25,628	19,396
	282,429	276,149	51,361
	986,481	980,692	952,734

The Doctor says that these returns have no appearance of incredibility, but that they afford as strong a proof of progressive depopulation as actual surveys can give. For my part, I cannot but think they carry evident marks of inaccuracy on the very face of them, and that they suggest the most erroneous ideas of our population at these several periods.

I might, in the first place, take notice of the impropriety of admitting *uninhabited* houses into a statement intended as a ground on which to form an estimate of the number of people; and that it would lead us to an error of more than a hundred thousand in each of these periods. However, I pass this over and proceed to observe, that as they are here introduced they naturally lead us to believe, contrary to the author's assertion, that our numbers have been gradually *increasing*. In the year 1761 there were above 25,000 *uninhabited* houses; but 1777 little more than 19,000. The natural conclusion is that the number of inhabitants, at the allowance of only 5 to a house, was augmented 30,000. By way of accounting for this, the Doctor says there was at this time a greater demand

demand for houses. I say so too; but we differ extremely as to those who became the tenants. Into these spare buildings I would put so many human beings with their respective families; whereas *he*, I suppose, will make the monster *luxury* to engross them all, without the addition of a single individual. Leaving those to believe this, who can, I pass on to another remark, which is this;

It appears from these returns that the number of houses excused on account of *poverty* was successively *diminished*; which is just the contrary of what *must* have been the case had the lists been correct. In the year 1761 there were above 5000 fewer exempted from this cause than in the year 59, and in 77 there were even 30,000 fewer. A striking evidence this of the incorrectness of the returns! It is allowed on all hands that the numbers, as well as distresses, of the poor, have greatly increased since the first of these periods. If the returns therefore had been accurate, the number of houses excused on account of poverty must have been greater and greater every year; just the reverse of what appears in the annual lists.

Mr. EDEN, by way of answer to the Doctor's first publication on this subject, asserts, without producing indeed any satisfactory evidence, that the return of cottages excused on account of poverty is uncertain and defective. To this unsupported assertion the Doctor has given no clear and

and decisive reply. He has indeed attempted it, but how successfully I leave the reader to determine. The singular manner in which he reasons for this purpose is worth observation.

In the first place, *he says*, the *uncertainty* in the returns of houses *not charged* does not at all affect the evidence arising from the diminution of the houses *charged*. I must beg the Doctor's pardon. The number of houses *charged*, if correctly returned, must *decrease* in exact proportion to the *increased* number of poor; since every poor man, who either receives parochial alms, or is exempted from contributing to parochial expences, is also exempted from paying the duty on windows and houses. Now if the number of houses thus excused on account of poverty be *not* accurately returned, the evidence arising from the whole, must be impaired precisely in proportion to that defect. Consequently this argument, or rather this *appearance* of an argument, for it is nothing more, entirely vanishes.

But it is observed 2dly "That the returns of these exempted cottages, have not been made with less care in 1777 than for 1761." With what care the returns have been made in *either* period, I shall not here stay to determine; I must, however, observe that if they *had* each time only been made with the *same* care; the whole number of houses returned

returned must from the allowed gradual increase of poverty, have been continually diminished.

We are next informed that the diminution which has *certainly* taken place in the number of houses *charged*, proves undeniably that there must have been a proportionable decrease in the houses *not* charged. Now if I am not strangely mistaken it proves the direct contrary. If the number of houses *charged* has *decreased*, the only natural conclusion is, that the number of houses *not* charged has *increased*, and that exactly in the same proportion; unless there is previously some absolute proof of the contrary.

These several appearances of inconsistency; these various presumptive marks of incorrectness might induce a philosophic enquirer after truth not to be over confident that they are any firm ground on which to erect a demonstrative proof of progressive depopulation.

But by pursuing this enquiry a little further we shall be convinced that the whole of our author's reasoning has not the smallest foundation in truth.

We are informed that the decreased returns of the surveyors afford as satisfactory evidence of the decline of population amongst us as an actual census or numbering of the inhabitants could do. I must beg leave to remark, by way of general pre-
para-

paratory answer, that although these returns, when viewed in their true light, (as will appear hereafter) afford a tolerable ground of just computation; yet, as far as our author has thought proper to state them, instead of amounting to *decisive proof*, they do not enable us to form even *probable conjecture*.

The case with regard to these returns stands thus. The parochial assessors are required by act of parliament annually to make out and return to the commissioners of the land and window tax a list of the dwellings chargeable with the duties on windows and houses in their respective parishes, specifying the number of windows in each of those that have *more* than six, and charging those which have *only* six or under, with nothing but the 3s. house duty. All the other dwellings inhabited by persons exempted from the usual taxes to church and poor, are exempted likewise from these duties, and are consequently not required to be inserted in the annual parochial lists or duplicates.

If the assessors *do* insert them they do more than their duty; which I suppose few of these gentlemen think necessary. These works of supererogation some of them however *do* perform; but they are a very inconsiderable part. I have received information from persons in almost every county in the kingdom upon this subject; and they, in general, concur in assuring me that the unassessed

houses

houses in their annual returns are *never* mentioned or taken any notice of. Many of them have satisfactorily confirmed this by giving me the number of houses returned in their respective parishes, and the number of houses *not* returned, nor ever appearing in any official list whatever. My own immediate and personal researches exactly correspond with these accounts. I have examined, with considerable care and attention, the parochial duplicates of whole divisions, not only for a few years now last past, but through almost every year since 1747. In about one parish in 15 or 20 I have found the exempted cottages put by themselves; while in the rest they are never once mentioned.

Indeed, the act of parliament itself, in the very strain and tenor of it, holds out peculiar motives to omit as many as possible. In some other publick returns there are most powerful inducements to *accuracy*. In the militia returns for instance the constable, if from private friendship or any other consideration he makes out a deficient list of persons *liable* to serve, his neighbours will generally set him right. For in exact proportion to this deficiency the chance to each individual of being ballotted into actual triennial service is increased. Hence these lists in general, but especially in small country parishes, where every man is known to his neighbour, are tolerably,

lerably correct. Again with respect to the land-tax, if the assessor wishes to lighten the burden of one neighbour, he cannot do it without increasing that of another; for the same total sum must at all events be raised. If he attempts it, therefore, that *other* will immediately exert himself to bring matters back to their proper equality. But notwithstanding these several judicious checks, it is very well known that wealth and greatness so successfully prevail over poverty and littleness, that there is often great incorrectness even in these returns. What shall we say then to the returns of the surveyors of the window lights, where a variety of motives must operate both on them and the rest of the parish to frequent connivance and omission? If they exempt any person, not a single individual pays a farthing the more; not a single individual therefore will probably trouble himself about it. If they assess the cottagers they will only bring an expence upon themselves and the rest of the parish by reducing them the sooner to the necessity of parochial assistance. Prudent parishes, therefore, will take care to excuse as many as they conveniently can. And when once exempted, they will soon vanish out of the annual returns; and you will very seldom be able ever to find them there again. So that from the very nature of the act of parliament it is reasonable to suppose that there have always been a great number of houses omitted in the annual returns, and that these omissions,

from

from the increase of poverty, as well as other causes above suggested, must be perpetually increasing.

These obvious conclusions of reason are confirmed by *indubitable facts*. I beg leave to produce a few instances both of absolutely deficient returns, and of the continued increase of that deficiency. That they may be perfectly unexceptionable I will place them at hazard, without any motive for selection, out of a great number of parishes from different counties. In the sequel, when I attempt to ascertain the present actual population of the kingdom, I shall present the reader with the whole table.

TABLE OF THE PRESENT ABSOLUTE DEFICIENCY OF RETURNS:

Counties.	Parishes.	Houses returned.	Not returned.	Total.
Essex	Thaxstead	102	248	350
	Toppesfield	38	67	105
	Lindsell	21	26	47
	Broxstead	42	50	92
	Little Baddow	40	24	64
Suffolk	Haverhill	55	91	146
Kent	Boughton	53	34	87
	Hunton	39	32	71
	Tudely	56	27	83
	Maidstone	623	483	1106
Suffex	Brightling	38	42	80
	Catsfield	23	27	50
Stafford	Abb. Bromley	161	85	246
	Old Swinford	414	1165	1579
Chester	Chester	1227	1656	2883
	Burton	41	54	95
				From

From the slightest inspection of this short table which I could easily make five times as long, it is obvious that, upon an average, not half the houses in the several places are returned by the parochial assessors. These deficient lists are deposited with the clerks of the commissioners to the land tax, copies of them are sent to the general surveyors for the division or county; by whom they are transmitted to the tax-office, and you may there be furnished with the aggregate deficient return for the whole kingdom. These returns to the tax-office afford not the least idea, nor give the slenderest clue by which to determine the numbers omitted; consequently, instead of amounting to *demonstrative proof* of our present state of population, they are no ground, in themselves considered, and as far as stated by our author, for even *probable conjecture*.

That the gradual *decrease* in these returns is no proof of a gradual decrease of inhabitants may be clearly concluded from the following short table.

TABLE OF GRADUAL DECREASE.

Counties.	Parishes.	1755	59	61	65	77	80	Total.
Essex	Thaxstead	167	157	140	139	108	102	350
	Lindsell	32	22	22	22	21	21	47
	Broxstead	49	49	49	47	42	42	92
Kent	Boughton	70	63	74	72	68	53	87
	Maidstone	656	656		651	633	623	1106
	1747 703							

There

There is a gradual decrease in the returns for most of these places, though there is actually the same number of houses in each respectively, in some of them more, than there were 25 years ago, and they are most of them fuller of people than ever. What then becomes of this argument of gradual depopulation deduced from the gradual decrease in the surveyors' returns? For what appears to have been the case with respect to these *few* places, there is no reason in the world to suppose it is not equally applicable to thousands of others, or even the kingdom at large; which we should have been enabled to see, had the clerks to the commissioners been always careful to preserve the annual returns. But as they have not, we can only make our deductions from analogy; an analogy however compleatly satisfactory, as there is not a shadow of objection, or the smallest degree of probability against it.

Upon the whole then the surveyors' returns, in themselves considered, are no rule by which to compute the actual population of the kingdom; nor is their continual decrease any evidence at all of a gradual diminution of people. The *general deficiency* is the immediate and natural result of the act of parliament itself; and the gradual *increased deficiency*, only proves, if it proves any thing, either the gradual increase of poverty, or the gradual increase of *cunning*, or as some would rather call it, of

wisdom and prudence in the parochial assessors, or the parishes at large. *

S E C T.

* That there have, from time to time, been orders to return the houses of all denominations, whether *charged* or *not charged*, cannot be disputed. But how well these orders have been *obeyed* may be pretty easily conjectured from the following letter which I have been favoured with, and which was written by a General Surveyor of the window lights in one of our principal counties.

FEB. 1, 1781.

“ The cottages have not been returned for *many* years till *last* year, and then many of the assessors did not do it till they came to the meeting, and so *guessed* at it as near as they could ; so that you see they are far from being *exact*.”

Here then it appears that there was no return of the cottages at all for many years till the year 1780. What then becomes of that perfect and compleat return in the year 1777, † which we are told has no appearance of incredibility, and which affords as strong a proof of progressive depopulation as actual surveys can give ?” In the county above alluded to there was doubtless no return at all of cottages for the year 1777 ; for three years cannot, I presume, with much propriety, be called *many* years. And when there was a return (which return, by the way, I am assured upon pretty good authority, was never taken an account of at the tax-office) the parochial surveyors only *guessed* at it ; and if there were only 40 or 50 houses in their parish they might, perhaps, *guess* pretty near the matter ; but as to *large towns*, in which there had been no previous enumeration, they could almost as well have told how many houses there are in Pekin or Constantinople. An actual survey of the houses in two very considerable places, the town of Stourbridge and parish of old Swinford in the county of Worcester, and the town and parish of Maidstone in the county of Kent, has been taken this spring. The total number in each, as well as those returned by the surveyors of the window lights, are as follow ;

No.

† Appendix to the Essay on the Population, &c. p. 38.

CHAP. II. SECT. I.

Examination of Dr. PRICE's Argument for Depopulation deduced from the decreased Number of Burials in the London Bills of Mortality.

WE may now proceed to the author's second argument of decreased population deduced from the decreased number of burials in the London bills of mortality.

But I must here beg leave first of all to observe that this, supposing it *true*, and supposing likewise that population is to be estimated from *burials* alone, without regard to *baptisms*, would only shew that *London* is decreased; which would be so far from proving that the rest of the kingdom was so, that, if the Doctor's maxim of the destructive influence of great capitals be true, it might afford, perhaps, no inconsiderable presumption that England was actu-

F 2 ally

	No. of Houses	returned
Stourbridge and Parish of old Swinford	1579	414
Maidstone	1106	623

If Dr. PRICE will produce a return of houses made at the tax office for either of these places since the year 1760, in which the amount is within 200 of the truth for each of them respectively, I will give him up all the arguments I have used upon this subject, and frankly acknowledge they are nothing to the purpose. On the contrary, if he *cannot* produce such return, I shall conclude that their force is unimpaired, and that his system of depopulation, as far as built on reasoning deduced from this quarter, is fairly overturned.

ally advancing in numbers; that the inhabitants of the town were retired into the country; that they were there employed in useful manufactures; in attending to the healthful and important business of agriculture, and in most successfully obeying the great command of *increase* and *multiply*; in a word, that we were likely soon to become a populous, and flourishing, a great and happy nation.

This seems, on our author's principles, the natural result of the supposition of a decreased metropolis. It is a point, however, on which I lay no stress; because I well know that the supposition itself is not founded in truth. The number of burials, in the bills of mortality, on which alone his reasoning is founded, is not less at present than at the revolution; on the contrary, it is considerably greater. On an average of ten years immediately subsequent to that period, they amounted to 21242,5
Whereas for ten years now last past the } 23340,5
average annual number is }
exceeding the former — — 2098,0

But we are told there are two considerations that more than counterbalance this. The 1st. is, that since the revolution there have been 12 new parishes taken into the bills; and that in these 12 parishes there were buried, in the years immediately succeeding those in which they were taken into the bills, 5000 annually. Now this 5000 we are to deduct

deduct, I suppose, from the present	}	23340,5
annual list of — —		
and the remainder is only — —		18340,5
indicating a decrease of — —		<u>2902,0</u>

Specious as this reasoning may seem at first view, it will, if I mistake not, on a closer examination appear to be a mere fallacy. 'Tis true these parishes did not come into the bills at the time of the revolution. And strange it would have been if they had. For unless my information deceives me, these *parishes* had then actually no *existence*. The space of ground, indeed, which they now comprehend was certainly just where it is at present, but it had no distinguishing parochial name. The true state of the case, it seems, is this. When the number of inhabitants in the city of London was so increased that the *old churches* were insufficient to contain all who wished to assemble for the worship of God, upon application to royal authority, *new churches* were erected; *new parishes* were formed out of the *old*; *new names* were appropriated to them; *new registers* were likewise opened, each thenceforth containing its own respective burials; and, if our author will take the pains to examine the bills of mortality at the particular periods when these changes took place, he will probably find that the burials of each *old parish* were immediately diminished in near proportion to the actual number

of those of the respective *new* parishes taken out of it, and that the aggregate of all the diminutions in the old registers is fully counterballanced by the total amount of numbers in the several *new* registers. Consequently the supposed addition to the bills becomes nothing more than an addition of names only.

I beg leave to illustrate this matter by, I believe, an exactly parallel case. At the æra of the revolution, the town of *Debitford* contained only the parish of St. Nicholas; and its number of *baptisms* during twenty years at that period was 4617
of *burials* — — — — — 4817

After this the parish was divided into two; and St. Paul's sprung out of St. Nicholas's. The new church immediately exhibited a very respectable list of births and burials; while the old one was diminished in exact proportion.

Their respective registers for twenty years from 1758 stand thus;

	<i>Baptisms.</i>	<i>Burials.</i>
St. Nicholas — — —	3211	3835
St. Paul — — —	3970	4917
Total	7181	8752

Although St. Nicholas therefore has not even yet quite recovered his pristine strength, yet when viewed

viewed in conjunction with St. Paul, he is more flourishing than ever; even to almost the double.

The case, I presume is, nearly the same with the old and new parishes in the city of London. But still we are told that the *dissenters* are greatly *decreased*, and that from thence great accessions have been annually made to the bills of mortality. Whether the *dissenters* of the city are *increased* or *decreased*, I shall not at present enquire. Our author *should* and probably *does* know this matter much better than I. The only thing to the purpose is, whether their *burials* are more or less *now* than at the *revolution*. I believe, I may venture to assert, that they are really not only *more*, but above *three* times more. Had this no other authority than my bare assertion, it might *fairly* be thought incredible; but I can produce such authentic evidence as I flatter myself, will meet with ready belief.

I do not know that we have any certain information as to the number of dissenting burials in the city at the æra of the revolution, nor at any time prior or subsequent to that period, but in the year 1729; when Mr. MAITLAND, author of a very voluminous history of the metropolis, collected, with great industry and care, a well authenticated list of their annual number. This gentleman, who seems ambitious to make our capital appear as large as possible, it will not be suspected would give

this list much *below* the truth. The only plausible apprehension would be, that it was *above* it; to me, however, it carries such marks of honest plainness that I scruple not to believe it was very near the matter; and I will suppose too, and I know not any great improbability in the supposition, that the dissenting burials were as numerous in 1729 as in 1688. If then another annual list of these burials, of equal authenticity can be obtained for the present time, the point in question will be ascertained with satisfactory precision. Such a list has been made out, with equal industry, and, I believe with equal accuracy of investigation and fidelity of report, in this very month of March 1781.

MR. MAITLAND'S LIST OF DISSENTING
BURIALS NOT ENTERED IN THE BILLS OF
MORTALITY IN THE YEAR 1729.

B A P T I S T.

In Mill Yard	- - - - -	28
Sheer-Alley, White-Street	- - - - -	21
Collier's Rents, White-Street	- - - - -	22
Glass-House-Yard, Pick-ax-Street	- - - - -	25
Bandy-Leg-Walk, Southwark	- - - - -	51
Broad-Street, Wapping	- - - - -	16
Peppermint-Street, Southwark	- - - - -	47
Independents	- - - - -	118

P R E S B Y T E R I A N.

Tindal's Burying-Ground, Bunhill-Fields,	500
	828

DISSENT.

DISSENTING BURIALS in the Year 1780.

B A P T I S T.		No.
Britain's Ground in Church-Lane,	}	520
White-Chapel		
Langford's Ground, Church-Lane.	—	100
Coughland's Ground, Holywell Mount	—	600
Brown's, Horseley Down, Southwark	—	36
Wallin's Ground, May's Pond	—	75
Crawford's Ground, Ewer-Street in the Mint		153
Mrs. Newton's, Pepper-Street	—	5
Matlock's, St. George's, Ratcliff-Highway		40
		1529

P R E S B Y T E R I A N.

Dr. Watfon's Ground, Deadman's Place	160
Tindal's Ground, Bunhill-Fields	— 1400
Total Presbyterian	1560

I N D E P E N D A N T.

Cartwright's Ground, Snow-Fields	—	10
Roger's Ground, Collier's-Rents, Long-Lane		70

Total Independent 80

Total of dissenting burials in 1780, 3169

In 1729, — — — 828

Increase 2341

Upon a comparison of these two lists it appears that the dissenting burials, in the most confined sense

sense of the word *dissenter*, instead of being *decreased*, as the Doctor intimates, are more than *three* times as many as they used to be. If we add the amount in each period to those in the bills respectively, we shall see the sum total of the city burials, as far, at least, as appears from this quarter, and the proportion they bear to each other, at the two periods.

	1st period	2d period
Burials annually in the bills on an average of 10 years	21242	23340
Dissenting burials - - - -	828	3169

Total in each 22070 26509

The latter period exceeds the former - 4439

Or if you even take the average only of the 3 last years, in the latter period, as, for reasons that will more fully appear hereafter, is but fair, the account will stand thus.

	1st period	2d period
Annual number in the bills on an average of 10 years in the first period	21242	
On an average of 3 years in the second		20668
Dissenting burials in each	828	3169

Totals 22070 23837

The latter period exceeds the former 1767

When

When I endeavour to ascertain the relative population of the city, I shall present another list of deficiencies of various kinds and from various quarters, much longer than that now given. Enough is here produced to establish our present point, which is, that our author's proof of depopulation deduced from the bills of mortality, like the former deduced from the official returns of houses, is absolutely nothing at all; its supposed foundation has no existence, and the superstructure endeavoured to be raised upon it, of course falls to the ground.

C A H P. III. S E C T. I.

Examination of Dr. PRICE's Argument of Depopulation deduced from the decreased annual Produce of the hereditary and temporary Excise.

ATHIRD proof of depopulation is drawn from the decreased annual produce of the hereditary and temporary excise. If this be admitted as a foundation on which to build an estimate of the increase or decrease of people, one might deduce conclusions, even from the Doctor's, own statement of the extracts from the excise books, the most extravagant and incredible. That I may not misrepresent this matter, I will give his whole table of extracts, page 47.

Annual-

Annual average of 3 } years ending at	1699	—	700,147
Two years ending at -	1699	—	381,886
— — — — —	1695	—	438,573
— — — — —	1703	—	473,799
— — — — —	1710	—	449,666
— — — — —	1719	—	509,370
— — — — —	1736	—	515,400
— — — — —	1746	—	495,749
— — — — —	1753	—	527,091
— — — — —	1761	—	575,280
Of four years ending at	1768	—	527,991
— — — — —	1774	—	520,613
— — — — —	1778	—	554,460

From this table it appears that the annual produce for three years ending at 1689 was £.740,147 and for two years ending at 1699 only 381,886 and consequently, by a fair application of the Dr's. argument, at least as stated in this table, the inhabitants of the kingdom, in the course of ten years, were decreased almost one half; a circumstance too extravagant for the most credulous to believe. This is a striking instance of the insufficiency of averages taken from *short periods*, to form any satisfactory estimate upon. But suppose we try it by the test of averages deduced from *long periods* the only way, in this case, of forming any rational estimate at all (even allowing the information from this quarter of any importance, which

which we shall presently shew it really is not,) how will the matter *then* stand? The average produce from 1686 to 1710, that is for 24 years was — — — — — £. 488,808.

And the average from 1751 to } 501,087.
1778, that is for 27 years, was }

Which, upon the assumed mode of reasoning, would indicate a small increase of population. Should we begin the former period at 1693, the average of 17 years would be — — 435,981

And the latter in the year 1759 the } 544,586
average for 19 years would be }

Consequently the augmentation of inhabitants more than one fifth.—Should this kind of arguing be admitted, therefore, upon the fairest, and most unexceptionable use of it, it would turn against our author.

But the truth is, no argument to establish the comparative number of people at different periods can be deduced from such precarious changeable premises. Could the real consumption of any article at different æras be accurately ascertained from the produce of the excise, (which I presume, however, cannot always be done) it would still authorize no conclusion as to the relative number of inhabitants; unless it was first proved that that article was at both periods, in the same degree of common use.

I will

I will instance in two most unexceptionable articles, and at present of more universal consumption than perhaps any other; I mean *wheat* and *beef*. In the northern parts of the kingdom there is, at least, ten times as much of these annually consumed as formerly. An ingenious man from this quarter, and of distinguished accuracy of observation, says, in a very obliging letter he has favoured me with, "Wheat, which is the bread now very generally
 "used, a hundred years ago, was rarely to be
 "found, even in the houses of our gentry. In a
 "small market town, called Ravenglass, at the
 "martinmas season, when the country lays in their
 "winter stores, they now will slaughter 200 black
 "cattle, whereas 60 years since they did not kill
 "ten." The case, I am assured, is similar to this, in all the counties of the north; and from the whole taken together, it may be fairly concluded, that they now consume ten, if not twenty times as much *beef* and *wheat* as their forefathers did at the time of the revolution. Our author will perhaps say, that all this increased consumption is occasioned by the enormous growth of *luxury*; for my part, I can only view it as a pleasing evidence of the increase of industry, the Improvements in agriculture, and the blessings of heaven, which seldom fail to attend them. But however we may differ in this particular, there is a circumstance in which I am sure we perfectly agree; and that is, that this increased consumption of *wheat* and *oxen* is no evidence

dence of a *proportionable* increase of *men and women*. And yet, unless I am strangely mistaken, it would be a conclusion altogether as just as the contrary one deduced from the *decreased produce of the hereditary and temporary excise*. For with regard even to *beer*, the most unexceptionable object of this excise, it would argue a strange ignorance of the usages of the middling and lower ranks of people among us, to suppose that it is nearly so common and universal a beverage, in country towns, villages, and parishes, especially in the maritime counties, as it was before the so general introduction of *smuggled spirits* and *smuggled tea*. It has been proved to the house of commons, upon pretty satisfactory evidence, that the contraband trade in these articles, annually deprives the revenue of nearly two millions sterling.* Now substitute the use

* That this account is not exaggerated may be clearly seen from the following detail, which I am assured is of indubitable authenticity.

In the year 1777 there were 2,500,000 gallons of geneva smuggled from Dunkerque; and 1,500,000 from Holland and other ports; in all 4,000,000; which at 2s. 6d. per gallon, is — — — £. 500,000

N. B. Hollands's geneva on importation pays a duty of 7s. 2d. per gallon, whereas the duty in this calculation is only 2s. 6d. that being nearly the duty paid for corn spirits made in England.

Rum smuggled from Guernsey and other ports, 800,000 gallons, which at 5s. per gallon is — — — 300,000

Brandies smuggled from different ports in France, Guernsey, Holland, and Germany, 2,000,000 gallons, at 7s. per gallon. — — — 700,000

In the year 1778 there were 10,000,000 lb. of tea smuggled into England, which on the average duty of 2s. 10d. per lb. is — — — 1,583,333

The total amount is — — — 2,783,333

use of one or the other of these in the room of beer, as they notoriously *are* substituted by great numbers of the poorer people, and there may be a very considerable decrease in the consumption of this article, without giving rise to any apprehension of a diminution of people. If we ascend from these lower classes to the next superior ranks, the farmers and tradesmen, we shall find that although good ale be still in use in their private houses, yet, that when they meet for the mutual transaction of business or for society, those who were once content with a pot of good October, must now have their bottle of wine or bowl of punch. All these circumstances duly considered, and that the public consumption of beer notwithstanding is not greatly diminished, from hence alone arises a strong presumption that our number of people, instead of being lessened, must be greatly increased.

SECT

This I have from the author of "Observations on smuggling humbly submitted to the consideration of the right honourable the house of peers and the honourable the house of commons in parliament assembled, in 1779," every article of which, he assures me, may be proved on the most satisfactory evidence. Besides all this, I may, from the same authority, remark, that there are at this very time some thousands of private stills in London and its environs that work prodigious quantities of spirits, which are consumed without paying any duty; and that this very *King's Town* and parish of Maidstone uses at present upon an average 700lb. of smuggled tea in a week. This I presume will pretty well supply the place of the ancient morning draught, and even afternoon refreshment. And it is likewise to be remembered that *half* this, at least, is consumed, not as an article of *luxury*, but as a common *beverage*; and, even further, that the farmers on our sea coasts, who in former days used to regale their harvest men with good beer, now give them gin or brandy.

N. B. The duties on geneva, &c. above set at 2s. 6d. by the additional duties on spirits, are now upwards of 3s. 6d.

S E C T. II.

Diminution of the Number of Victuallers.

THE diminution of the number of our victuallers our author contends, p. 21, is likewise "a fact of particular consequence to establish his point; because victuallers include all that keep houses for selling strong liquors." I am ready to grant that this fact is altogether of as much importance to confirm his general assertion as those he had before adduced; but whoever really thinks it of any importance at all, will be much deceived. In all smuggling counties, where the use of spirituous liquors is most frequent, it is notorious, that almost in every country parish there are two or three *private unlicensed brandy shops* at which five times as much of that liquor, and of those of a similar kind, are constantly sold as at the public house by the licenced victualler.

S E C T. III.

The Ease with which King WILLIAM raised Troops.

OUR author further observes, p. 22, "that he cannot help mentioning, as an additional fact, indicating a particular degree of populousness at the revolution, that King

G

William

“ William wanting, in 1689, to raise 23 new
 “ regiments for the war in Ireland, the levies
 “ were compleated in six weeks.” In answer to
 this, it may be sufficient to remark, that the ease
 with which soldiers are raised in any country, is,
 of itself and unconnected with other circumstances,
 no indication of populouness at all: Towards the
 close of Marlborough's glorious campaigns against
 the French, Lewis the XIVth might soon have had
 the 4th part of the kingdom of France in his ar-
 mies, if he could but have clothed and fed
 them. And were Great Britain now reduced to the
 same deplorable situation, which, thank God, is far
 from being the case, George the III^d at the 1st beat
 of the drum, might find a full quarter of his subjects
 most ready volunteers. Destroy our commerce,
 turn our manufacturers out of employment, and bid
 the plough stand still, and in two months time, even
 though our population were much less than it really
 is, you might raise an army, not only of 23 re-
 giments, but of 23 times 23; provided you could
 put clothes on their backs, money in their poc-
 kets, and food in their mouths.

Upon the whole, then, neither the *speculative*
arguments urged by the Doctor to evince the de-
 population of this country, nor the *positive proofs*
 he has brought to establish the fact, afford the
 smallest degree of rational conviction. As they
 were however so seriously and confidently urged
 by

by a writer of so much distinction, I should hardly have ventured to have called them in question, had I not *positive evidence* to produce that the truth of the case is directly contrary to his assertion. This positive evidence I now proceed to lay before the reader;



P A R T. III.

Proofs of increased and increasing Population.

HAVING shewn as I conceive in the two preceding parts, that there is no reason to conclude, either from speculative arguments, or positive evidence, that this kingdom has been, as Dr. PRICE asserts, wasting away by a gradual depopulation from the revolution to the present time, I shall now endeavour to establish on what I think very solid grounds the directly opposite doctrine; viz. that the number of our inhabitants has been for many years past in a state of progressive increase, and particularly that it is now much larger than it was at the time of the revolution.

The most compleat and satisfactory mode of ascertaining this point would have been an actual enumeration of the people, or at least of the houses at these two different periods; but government never having thought fit, (for what reason I know not) to adopt this obvious method, we must be content with such other means of calculation as are within our reach.

Now the most authentic source of information next after this which presents itself, is the evidence of parish registers. And this I first sought for in
the

the registries of several dioceses. But I soon found that except in a few instances, of which I have availed myself, but little satisfaction was to be expected from this quarter. My next application therefore was to the clergy themselves for extracts from the registers of their respective parishes. And here I must with the greatest gratitude acknowledge that I have been favoured with a large number of extracts, and much useful information, collected with accuracy, and communicated with liberality.

There are, it must be acknowledged, several circumstances which (as some of my ingenious correspondents have very justly observed) may sometimes affect the force of register evidence. But after considering them with a good deal of attention, there is only one, which, in the present enquiry, appears to me of any great importance; and that is, the different degrees of *healthiness*, or to speak with more precision, the different degrees of *mortality* at the two periods between which we mean to form a comparison. Both the baptisms and burials of one period may be considerably more than at the other, and yet the real population, or the actual number of living inhabitants, may be less. Now it will I think be readily acknowledged that this circumstance is greatly in favour of the present time compared with the æra of the revolution. Considerable improvements (as I have before observed) have taken place in the cleanliness

cleanliness and airiness of our towns, streets and houses, and the general treatment of diseases of almost every kind. These and many other causes which will readily occur to every thinking man, must have preserved the lives of prodigious numbers; and whoever will take the pains to consult the parish registers, either of large and populous towns, or even in smaller villages and country parishes, and compare their testimony at different periods with that of actual enumerations, will, if I am not much mistaken, find abundant proofs of this fact. I have had an opportunity of making very minute enquiries into this circumstance in the towns of Braintree in Essex and Maidstone * in Kent, and the result is an ample confirmation of the position here advanced. The detail would be too tedious and uninteresting to lay before the reader; and therefore I shall only add that I have very good reasons for stating the average proportion of diminished mortality in great towns at about 1-4th, in country parishes at 1-10th and on a combination of both at more than 1-8th,†. Should it then even appear from the register extracts (which it

most

* Judging from register evidence alone the town of Maidstone is not increased above one twentieth, since the revolution, whereas it is manifest by actual surveys made at the two periods, that it is increased more than 1-4th; which difference evidently arises from the different degrees of mortality at the two periods.

† With respect to country parishes, Mr. ARTHUR YOUNG, in some papers which he has favoured me with, has given a curious detail of the gradual increase of health.

most certainly does not,) that the number of baptisms and burials at the revolution was even an eighth more than those of the present time, yet still the living population would be nearly the same.

S E C T. I.

Register Evidence applied to ascertain the relative Population of the City of London.

HERE we must have recourse to the bills of mortality which exhibit to us in one view, the register evidence respecting London. And from these it appears that the medium annual

G 4

average

healthiness in the parish of North Runcion in the county of Norfolk, during the 150 years now immediately past, by which it appears that its degree of mortality in the course of that period has been diminished almost 1-5th, and which he ascribes to the better living of the poor. A striking instance to the same purpose in the parish of Great Chart, near Ashford in the county of Kent, has been sent me. Its burials in a period of twenty years immediately subsequent to the revolution were 192—but almost 100 of them were occasioned by the small-pox; whereas in 20 years beginning with 1760, there appears to have been only 4 or 5 who died of that disorder; This diminution my ingenious correspondent imputes to inoculation, and adds “that no register can, as yet, properly inform us of the thousands that have been preserved by this salutary practice for these 20 years past all over the kingdom. As they have been chiefly infants and young people they are ordinarily too young to die, and scarce yet old enough to marry; but they are latent in society, and will greatly swell both registers in due time.” These instances alone may induce the reader to believe that the above average of diminished mortality is not set too high.

average of the births and burials for 10 } 18,400.
years beginning with the year 1681 is

For the same number of years beginning } 20,355.
with the year 1771 is — —

This shews an increase of — — 1,955,

or about one tenth; which supposing the bills equally accurate at both periods, and that the healthiness of the city and every other circumstance remained nearly the same, would enable us to ascertain, the relative degree of population. But in these respects there is a prodigious deficiency.

With regard to the bills I have already noticed their deficiency as far as it is occasioned by the burials of that part of the dissenters, usually comprehended under the several denominations of *Presbyterians, Independents, and Baptists*. But there are other sects, such as *Quakers, Methodists, Moravians, &c.* whose annual burials, which are not entered in the bills of mortality, are as follows,

	in 1729	in 1780
Quakers — — —	245	117
Puckeredge's Ground, Baker's	}	16
Row, White-chapel, a reputed		
Quaker, but his Ground com-		
mon		

S A B B A T A R I A N.

Noble's Ground, Mill Yard, Good-	}	20
man's Fields		
Morgan's Ground — — —		6

Methodists, &c		
Northampton Chapel	2080	
Worships Ground, Mile End	138	
Wesley's new Ground, Moorfields	41	
In the burial Ground at Whitfield's	325	}
Tabernacle		

Totals	245	2743
--------	-----	------

Increase	—	2498
----------	---	------

FOREIGN DISSENTING BURIALS.

Dutch Chapel, Austin Friars	3
Lutheran Chapel, Savoy	22
German Calvinistical ditto	6
Lutheran Church	4

Total	35
-------	----

In Maitland's List	21
--------------------	----

Increase	14
----------	----

JEWISH BURIALS.

Dutch Jews, Mile End	100
Portuguese ditto	125
At Hoxton-Square, from the	15
Hamburgh Synagogue	

Total	240
-------	-----

In Maitland's List	125
--------------------	-----

Increase	115
----------	-----

But besides dissenting and jewish burials, which never enter the annual bills, there is a vast number of others under the same predicament.

The first I shall shew the reader are those of St. Paul's cathedral, *St. Peter in Vinculo*, or *Tower of London Church*, the *Rolls Chapel*, the *Charter House*, the *Temple Church*, *Lincoln's-Inn*, *Westminster-Abbey and Cloisters*. From most of these places, by the very active researches of a most obliging friend, I am furnished with the register extracts, both at the revolutionary period and the present; and with regard to the rest, which are indeed comparatively inconsiderable, the accounts are derived from the communication of persons well qualified in every respect to give authentic intelligence.

**AVERAGE of ANNUAL INTERMENTS AT THE
REVOLUTION AND AT PRESENT AT THE FOLLOWING PLACES.**

	1st period.	2d period.
St. Paul's — — — —	no register.	2
Tower Church during 177 years } only 11	8	12
Charter-House — — —	8	8
Temple Church — — —	13	15
Lincoln's-Inn — — —	3	1½
Westminster Abbey and Cloisters	16	12
	48	50½
Increase		2½
		Let

Let us next go to the hospitals, which make so magnificent a figure in our capital, and of which far the greater part has risen up long since the revolution.

The total amount of the burials from these which do not enter into the bills of mortality, I cannot precisely ascertain. In those hospitals from which I have received satisfactory information they are as follows.

	1st period.		2d period.	
In St George's	—	—	—	95
Guy's about	—	—	80	120
Bartholomew's	—	—	—	150
			80	285
Increase	—	—		365

These are all the accounts that I can depend upon. Those others, however, which Mr. Maitland has inserted in his list of 1729, amount to about 45, which I will suppose were nearly the same as the annual average both at the revolution and now. these added to the former make the whole of the hospital burials for the two periods stand thus.

	1st period.		2d period.	
—	—	—	125	410
			—	—
Increase	—	—		285
				Ye

We have hitherto only sought for the dead within the limits of the city; we will now extend our enquiries to the villages around it, where we shall find no inconsiderable number. The change that has taken place in this respect, during the present century, is allowed on all hands to have been prodigious. Modern luxury, or modern vanity, call it which you please, send out their multitudes both alive and dead, which ancient simplicity, or ancient poverty confined, both in life and death, to the same smoky spot. The person who a hundred years ago would have contented himself with lodgings, or at most a single house, must now have a magnificent building in town, and another of equal elegance in the country. The greater part of his family are chiefly in the rural mansion, where he himself passes his nights, and only repairs to the city for the transaction of his commercial affairs by day; and if he himself, his family, or any of his domestics, fall sick, they are probably nursed in the country, and if they die are there buried.

To these we may add those multitudes which annually swarm from this immense hive, into almost every part of the kingdom, to Bath, Tunbridge, Scarborough, and other places of general resort, which modern wealth has opened on all sides. Others mean time, cross the channel and visit our neighbours in France, Flanders, Germany, &c.

&c. Many of both these, whether their excursions were made for the recovery of health, or mere dissipation and amusement, come back no more, but die and are buried in some distant part of their native land, or in foreign countries. From all these causes the *external* burials of London must be incomparably more numerous than in former days; especially so long ago as the revolution. It would be to little purpose to attempt to ascertain the total number of the various kinds above alluded to. The utmost we can hope to know, with any degree of certainty and precision, are those which annually take place in the villages round London to the distance of ten or twelve miles.

Mr. MAITLAND found them even in the year 1729 considerably more than a thousand. It is probable that this is three times as much as they were at the revolution; and it is equally probable that since that time they have been increased three times more: this has certainly been the case with regard to some of the most considerable of them; I mean Pancras, Paddington and Marybone, as appears from the registers of those three places. From some other parishes, I am assured that their burials, which are very numerous, are nearly half of them from London. I am convinced therefore that 3000 would not be too great an allowance for the present annual burials of the city of London

don in the circumjacent villages. As I wish, however, to be rather *below* the mark than *above* it, I will set them only at — — — 2000

I will also admit that at the revolution }
they were } 500

Which is probably more than the truth, there will remain — — — 1500
for the excess of these annual interments of the city in the neighbouring villages beyond what they were at the revolution.

The burials from the East India Company's ships are now annually — — — 500

In the year 1729 (when they were probably much more than at the revolution) they were only } 198

Increase 302

The present annual executions, on an average of 8 years the humane Mr. Howard informs us are — — — 34

In Mr. Maitland's list they are only — 24

Increase 10

We have hitherto sought the deficiencies of the bills of mortality in the mansions of the *dead*. We will now enter on a more agreeable search, and give the reader the pleasure of finding them likewise (to use a seemingly inconsistent expression) in the houses of the *living*. Many of that class of human beings who used to be annually doomed to certain death,

death, are now as constantly preserved, to enjoy the blessing of life, and to be of future service to their country. In the year 1767, in consequence of the humane suggestions of Mr. JONAS HANWAY, an act of parliament was passed obliging the parish officers of the cities of London and Westminster to send their infant poor to be nursed in the country at proper distances from town. Before this benevolent measure took place, not above 1 in 24 of the poor children received into the work-houses lived to be a year old; so that out of 2800, the average annual number admitted, 2690 died. Whereas since, only about 450 die in the work-houses, (where by the act they are to be only three weeks,) and 150 in the country; which makes in all 600. Those, however, who die in the country are no part of our present enquiry. The diminution of the burials in *London* only is the object of our research. And it is manifest that by the regulations of this act they were diminished 2240 in the very first year after its passing. But this is not all. I am assured that before the expiration of the *second* year far the greater part of the small remainder of children used not uncommonly to be dead likewise. So that we may fairly reckon that the London burials in the 2d year after this act took place were lessened above 2300. This diminution must have still continued to go on till the return of the children into the city; which by the law is not, I think,

think, to be before they are six years old. However, as some of them, it must be acknowledged, certainly come back to their mothers long before that, we will only suppose that the 2300 was the annual diminution, during the first six years after the commencement of the act, that is, from the year 1767 to 1773. After the return of the children, as some of them must die, this diminution must have gradually decreased from the year 1773 inclusive to the present time. I will admit that this decrease now amounts to 200, and the remainder 2100 will shew the present annual diminution in the burials of the bills of mortality from the salutary regulations of this act of parliament.*

These must doubtless be taken into the estimate of the relative population of the city from its burials. And after we have taken an account of them as supposed to be *dead*, we are to remember that most of them are still *alive*; and that instead of concluding from this diminution in the bills, that the inhabitants are decreased upwards of 40,000, they are nearly 25,000 increased. I cannot here stay to make those reflections which the feelings of humanity would naturally suggest, and which the lover of his country must gladly indulge. I must hasten

* I cannot too thankfully acknowledge the obliging civility, as well as minute precision and accuracy, with which Mr. HANWAY communicated the substance of the above information. If I have deduced any false conclusions from it, made it the ground of fallacious reasoning or fallen into any mistake relative to it, he will not a little increase the obligation already conferred if he will be kind enough to correct me.

hasten to present the reader, in one collective view, with the whole lists of burials not entered in the bills of mortality, and of those which would have been entered but for the humane and judicious regulations of this act of the legislature.

DEFICIENCIES IN THE BILLS of MORTALITY AT THE REVOLUTION AND AT PRESENT.

			1st Period.	2d Period
Dissenting burials	—	—	828	3169
Foreign Dissenting ditto	—	—	21	35
Quakers	—	—	245	117
Reputed Quakers	—	—		16
Sabbatarian	—	—		26
Methodists, &c.	—	—		2701
Jews	—	—	125	240
In Westminster Abbey, St. Paul's, &c.			48	50
In hospitals	—	—	125	285
In the neighbouring villages	—	—	500	2000
In the E. India Com's service abroad			198	500
Executions	—	—	24	34
Prevented by Mr. Hanway's act of Pmt.				2100

Total 2114 11273

Add these two sums to the number of burials in the bills of mortality at the two periods respectively and the account will appear thus,

			1st Period	2d Period
Burials included in the bills			21124	20668
Out of the bills	—	—	2114	11273
Total			23238	31941
H	Increase			8703

Supposing therefore the city just as healthy now as at the revolution, its population is increased more than 1-4th. But it is a pleasing truth, which Dr. PRICE himself is ready to acknowledge, that the circumstance of healthiness is greatly in favour of the present time. It may be thought, at first sight, that the healthiness of London is more increased than that of country towns; and, as far as it has been occasioned by widening of streets, taking down of signs, removing obstructions, and promoting a fuller and freer circulation of fresh air, it is probably true. But it must be remembered that the diminished mortality of the latter appears to be chiefly owing to the salutary practice of inoculation; whereas, in the former, for want of *universality*, it has hitherto been of little advantage. On an average of ten years last past, as appears from the bills of mortality, the number of persons annually dying of the small-pox is considerably more than in the same compass of time immediately subsequent to the revolution. In provincial towns and villages, as soon as this disorder makes its appearance, inoculation takes place amongst all ranks of people; the rich and poor, from either choice or necessity, almost instantly have recourse to it; and where two or three hundred used to be carried to their graves in the course of a few months, there are now perhaps not above 20 or 30. At London the case, I presume, is far different; a few are inoculated, and, perhaps, the infection by their means is communicated to thousands, who might
other-

otherwise have escaped the disease as long as they lived. But although, for these reasons, the diminished mortality of the capital may not be so considerable as that of country towns; I believe it will not be thought an extravagant supposition that its degree is at least one tenth, the ratio above laid down for the whole kingdom. This, added to the present annual number of burials, will shew the population to be increased since the revolution nearly one third; and that its actual amount cannot be less than between seven or eight hundred thousand; even exclusive of Pancras and Marybone, and perhaps some other places, which may justly be comprehended under the general idea of our capital, and are chiefly the growth of modern times, and would probably give us an addition of fifty or sixty thousand. *

Having thus discovered that our *metropolis* is not in a state of depopulation we may proceed with courage to inferior places. The *heart* of the empire is sound, and we may hope its *limbs* are healthy and vigorous. Let us then take a view of its nearer parts; I mean the immediate vicinity of London, to the distance of eight or ten miles. Which way the course of population has here been, the following register extracts, for the two periods in question, will pretty clearly shew.

H 2

BAPTISMS

* From the above detail it must be extremely obvious, that by computing the number of inhabitants in London from the present wretchedly imperfect bills of mortality alone we fall short of the truth considerably more than one third; perhaps very little less than three hundred thousand souls.

**BAPTISMS AND BURIALS IN THE VILLAGES
ROUND LONDON FOR TWO PERIODS OF
TWENTY YEARS EACH, THE FIRST BEGINNING
ABOUT THE REVOLUTION, THE SECOND WITH
THE YEAR 1758—60, OR 61.**

Parishes.		First Period.		Second Period	
		Bapt.	Bur.	Bapt.	Bur.
Clapham	—	340	400	720	1080
Deptford	-	4618	4817	7191	8951
Streatham	—	403	448	645	951
Woodford	—	394	410	704	762
Kensington	—	1734	2514	2419	3571
Eltham	—	515	525	731	864
Tooting	-	139	132	283	328
Fulham	-	1434	1640	1793	2531
HammerSmith	—	1653	1816	2011	2542
Chiswick	-	967	1286	1715	2354
Greenwich	—	3754	3755	5125	5924
Walthamstow	—	666	778	877	1125
Dulwich	-	149	60	523	408
Highgate Chapel		591	219	768	304
Chelsea	—	1109	1347	2720	4746
Wanstead	-	156	197	289	462
St. Pancras	—	539	1281	809	6063
Camberwell	—	688	965	1549	2681
Westham	-	1205	1662	3161	3811
Bromley	—	711	771	1087	1143
Lewisham	—	707	793	1195	1398
					Lec

Lee - - - - -	93	138	115	593
Paddington - - -	206	828	273	3851
Wandsworth - - -	1052	1161	2295	2620
Stoke Newington -	220	438	376	960
Kentish Town -	539	1281	809	6263

Total 20782 31342 39383 66276

The burials must here be thrown intirely out of the question, on account of the number of them from London. If we judge then by the baptisms alone the population of these parishes now and immediately subsequent to the revolution is as 39383, to 20782, or nearly doubled; and if we make the addition of 1-10th for the ratio of diminished mortality, considerably more so.

We will now extend our enquiry further into the country and take a view of some of the principal parts of the kingdom. And first let us examine the fertile and populous county of Kent.

K E N T.

Parishes.	First Period.		Second Period.	
	Bapt.	Bur.	Bapt.	Bur.
Deptford - —	4617	4817	7181	8752
Tudely — —	106	57	277	172
T. Sutton — —	254	186	265	221
Chart - — —	164	130	192	105
Goudhurst — —	783	756	910	603
Chatham — —	4080	4417	5582	5622
Stroud — —	986	1123	1199	1405
Shorne — —	288	404	322	385
Otham — —	93	74	155	145
Staplehurst — —	321	336	463	388
Cranbrook — —	880	1196	1202	1178
Farningham — —	104	116	216	198
Horton Kirby — —	164	154	196	138
Brenchley — —	633	486	849	492
Seal — —	338	268	576	468
Sevenoaks — —	1150	976	1439	1264
Yalding — —	470	385	888	578
Sutton near Dart- } ford }	211	209	308	288
Boughton Malherb	117	100	209	99
Aylesford — —	318	312	458	328
Burram — —	75	40	67	53
Wouldham - — —	60	66	102	56
Lee - - - —	93	138	115	593
Bromley - - —	711	771	1087	1143
Chislehurst - —	296	287	421	407

St.

Parishes		Bapt.	Bur.	Bapt.	Bur.
St. Mary Cray	—	183	200	322	282
Lewisham	- —	707	793	1195	1398
West-Wickham	- —	117	141	174	197
Beckenham	- —	239	223	444	531
Pembury	- —	194	163	289	223
Laybourne	- —	72	47	129	74
Boxley	- —	405	307	542	452
Sandwich	— —	1765	1865	1408	1229
Eastry	- —	300	211	371	254
Lenham	— —	423	344	869	549
Tenterden	— —	563	669	873	725
Crayford	— —	295	337	696	621
Dodington	— —	74	52	194	138
Wickling	— —	41	28	74	43
Mereworth	- —	173	115	304	196
Harrietsham	- —	181	160	274	177
West Farleigh	— —	85	66	128	102
Teston	- —	48	47	67	75
Cuxton	- - —	71	95	112	75
Rochester St. Nicholas	} —	1691	2261	1557	1661
St. Margaret	—	1261	1042	984	1038
Hunton	- - —	148	108	233	192
East Farleigh	—	201	184	302	219
Boughton	- —	213	143	316	242
Loose	- - —	183	144	250	186
Linton	- - —	159	157	296	223
Detling	— —	121	119	139	76
Hawkhurst	- —	521	598	778	505
		H 4		Bar-	

Parishes.	First Period		Second Period.	
	Bapt.	Bur.	Bapt.	Bur.
Barming	85	74	118	96
Maidstone	2608	2984	3058	2847
Marden	688	551	683	462
Brabourne	184	137	166	148
Monks-horton	106	64	100	55
East Malling	462	—	574	442
Addington	82	75	108	104
Sundridge	373	352	411	327
Hollingbourne	268	189	441	294
Ashford	760	784	628	634
Great Chart	281	192	301	172
Kingsnorth	111	106	123	82
Welmington	210	209	243	237
Darenth	188	127	208	188
Wrotham	452	343	651	499
	34524	30977	43733	40949

These register extracts are perhaps no inadequate representation of those of the intire county. They comprehend places of every size and every description in it, from its largest towns to its smallest parishes; if, there are on the one hand the rising villages in the vicinity of London, there are on the other those which have experienced peculiar causes of depopulation. The towns of Maidstone and Cranbrook, the villages of Sutton, Hawkhurst, and Marden have each lost

no

no inconsiderable manufacture. The loss however has been amply compensated, by the great improvements in agriculture, either in themselves or in the country adjacent; for these five places taken together are considerably increased. And the population of the whole county appears to be advanced since the revolution about a fourth.

It has long been a general apprehension, that the increase of great towns has been occasioned by the depopulation of the *adjacent villages*. In particular parts of the kingdom, for reasons already taken notice of, this may, in some measure at least, have been the case. But with regard to the county of Kent, it is manifest from the slightest inspection of the foregoing table that the fact is directly the reverse. No places appear so much decreased as the town of Sandwich and the city of Rochester. The country parishes, on the contrary, are generally increased one third and some are more than doubled.

Let us next cross the Thames into the county of Essex, and see whether any desolation appears there.

ESSEX

E S S E X.

Parishes	First Period.		Second Period.	
	Bapt.	Bur.	Bapt.	Bur.
Felstead - - —	473	447	729	549
Stebbing - - —	571	435	687	491
Toppesfield —	252	149	339	266
Great Yeldham —	148	130	246	170
G. Baddow - - —	504	568	537	471
Coggeshall - - —	857	1741	1454	1789
Copford - - —	168	154	239	193
Kelvedon - - —	371	320	486	534
Sible Headingham	525	383	815	722
Rayne - - —	177	131	212	157
Ashen - - —	79	72	141	88
Tilbury near Clare	59	61	115	59
Ovington - - —	36	30	43	48
Bocking - - —	1713	1516	1838	1915
Wanstead - - —	156	197	289	462
Woodford - - —	394	410	704	762
Walhamstow —	666	778	877	1115
Harlow - - —	446	478	580	509
Castle Headingham	355	440	384	423
Maplestead - - —	130	71	187	158
Stifted - - —	341	270	377	334
Sandon - - —	132	100	176	149
Farnham - - —	158	139	196	152
Witham - - —	791	916	837	1012
Halstead - - —	1616	1607	1901	2099
Colne Engaine —	121	119	270	220
				High

Parishes.	First Period.		Second Period.	
	Bapt.	Bur.	Bapt.	Bur.
High Ongar - —	225	194	379	282
Panfield - - —	127	57	142	108
Fordham - - —	243	166	306	270
Bumstead - - —	258	163	317	210
Romford - - —	1003	1378	1453	1698
Braintree - - —	918	1173	952	1714
H. Roding - - —	150	61	192	108
Colchester, Trinity	462	328	217	233
— All-Saints and	1089	1164	796	1051
— St. Botolph				
— St. Leonard —	317	628	311	443
— St. James - —	704	1134	558	736
Lexden - - —	328	391	316	282
Gr. and Lit. Birch	195	151	252	235
Gosfield - - —	125	154	226	163
Bardfield Saling -	65	67	131	57
Great Saling —	90	75	160	82
Total	16605	16991	20299	20559

The increase of population in this county appears from these extracts to be only 1-5th. But this is most probably far below the average increase of the county; for to avoid all possible imputation of an unfair selection of places, I have designedly fixed upon four of the largest towns and the most unpromising I could think of. I mean Colchester, Coggeshall, Braintree, and Halstead; for as in all those I had reason to believe

the

the woollen manufactory was greatly declined, I was apprehensive that no inconsiderable depopulation had been the consequence. But I find, to my great satisfaction, that Colchester is the only one of the four that has suffered any material diminution; that the numbers in Coggeshall are advanced very much, and that those of Braintree and Halstead are certainly not gone backwards.

I shall now give register extracts from the counties of Sussex and Surrey.

SUSSEX

S U S S E X.

Parishes.	First Period.		Second Period.	
	Bapt.	Bur.	Bapt.	Bur.
Hooe — —	93	100	262	121
Ninfield — —	117	146	290	152
Crowhurst — —	96	93	103	87
Warbleton — —	235	220	420	269
Oare near Hastings	78	83	138	73
Ashburnham —	218	163	244	168
Catsfield —	140	99	166	91
Brightling —	214	161	264	185
Bexhill — —	340	491	449	293
Battle — —	627	518	946	605
Penhurst —	73	37	48	21
Mountfield —	146	126	265	136
Whatlington —	71	37	114	54
Saddlecomb —	152	135	250	173
Hertsmanceux	240	207	407	260
Dallington —	229	188	158	128
Northiam —	237	185	419	254
Pulborough —	403	360	684	459
Total	3709	3349	5627	3529

SURREY

S U R R E Y.

Parishes.	First Period.		Second Period.	
	Bapt.	Bur.	Bapt.	Bur.
Abinger — —	215	183	376	253
Albury — —	232	205	221	198
Shere — —	312	266	413	373
Wotton — —	122	104	235	188
Newdigate — —	204	127	307	182
Guildford — —	269	270	341	306
—St. Trinity — —	449	467	346	402
Clapham — —	340	400	720	1080
Streatham — —	403	448	645	951
Tooting — —	139	132	283	328
Dulwich — —	149	60	523	408
Dorking — —	1030	1039	1378	1133
Epsom — —	619	672	1022	1218
Camberwell — —	688	965	1549	2681
Mortlake — —	633	728	684	921
Richmond — —	1274	1280	2228	2284
Wimbledon — —	631	295	589	895
Total	7709	7641	11860	13801

With respect to the registers of these two counties it is obvious that taken together they are advanced above 1-3d; and that Suffex is more increased than Surrey. This latter circumstance is a fresh confirmation of the falsity of the general idea, that if the inhabitants in towns are

are multiplied, it is from the depopulation of country parishes. For the Suffex registers are intirely of this latter description with the single exception of the town of Battle ; which indeed is scarce an exception, as it is little more than a neat and populous village. With respect to Surrey, it is remarkable that the burials exceed the baptisms ; which is occasioned by a considerable share of parishes being in the vicinity of London.

I proceed to the five south-western counties of Hants, Wilts, Devon, Dorset, and Cornwall.

HANTS:

H A N T S.

Parishes.	First Period.		Second Period.	
	Bapt.	Bur.	Bapt.	Bur.
Fareham — —	769	708	979	743
Lawton — —	217	275	491	300
Bishop's Waltham	778	593	916	698
St. Maurice	619	456	902	912
St. Mary's				
St. Peter's in Winchester				
Portsea — —	1455	1303	7243	7598
Total	3838	3335	10531	10251

W I L T S.

Steeple Langford —	221	187	282	289
--------------------	-----	-----	-----	-----

D E V O N.

Yealmpton —	334	346	524	406
Torrington —	1348	1495	890	963
Puslinch — —	183	155	238	127
Holfworthy —	365	482	411	351
Total	2230	2478	2063	1847

D O R S E T

D O R S E T.

		First Period.		Second Period.	
Shillingstone	—	136	144	186	114
Stour Pain	- —	158	137	174	116
Furstmell Mag.	—	263	245	253	288
Bellchallwell	—	61	54	64	58
Shroton	- - —	106	86	236	154
Total		724	666	913	730

C O R N W A L L.

St. Kevern	- —	753	680	994	809
------------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

Perhaps these extracts are not sufficiently numerous to form a satisfactory average. As far as their evidence goes, we must conclude these counties are nearly doubled, whether we calculate by births, or burials, or by the combination of both.

The next extracts are from the eastern counties of Suffolk and Norfolk. And first

I

SUFFOLK

S U F F O L K.

Parishes	First Period		Second Period.	
	Bapt.	Burials	Bapt.	Burials
St. Edmund's Bu- ry, St. James }	2286	2021	1477	1855
St. Mary's - —	2377	2341	1634	2161
Clare - - - —	518	438	630	569
Haverhill - —	234	440	478	667
Great Thurlow —	106	122	146	167
Bungay, St. Mary	534	554	573	505
— St. Trinity	199	220	424	258
Sudbury, St. Greg.	680	720	691	695
— S. Peter	953	769	872	718
Bardwell - - —	210	175	225	172
Ixworth - - —	374	277	406	278
Ipswich, St. Mary	308	312	433	313
— St. Lawrence	221	241	140	149
— St. Peter's	364	377	458	416
— St. Stephen's	222	217	208	251
— St. Nicholas	334	476	373	386
— St. Clements	1217	1127	1191	1270
— St. Mary Eton	161	229	164	210
— St. Matthew's	430	484	575	580
— St. Mary Key	379	246	335	354
Thwaite - - —	39	28	52	23
Beccles - - —	1220	1268	1206	1128
Weston - - —	58	79	131	69
Hawstead - —	153	119	232	149

Homer

Parishes		First Period		Second Period	
		Bapt.	Burials	Bapt.	Burials
Homers-field	—	67	53	90	34
St. Peter's	- —	46	68	69	32
Sancroft	- —	70	46	95	55
Mettingham	- —	106	94	126	96
St. Andrew Illketshall		103	82	225	134

Total 13827 13157 13932. 12615

From the register extracts of this county it seems to be but little increased. This appearance however is delusive; and the deception is easily explained. In the first place, I have chosen three towns the most likely to be decreased of any in the county; St. Edmunds Bury, Ipswich, Sudbury: But in fact only one of the three, that is, St. Edmunds Bury, is really diminished. The other two, even on the face of the register, are a little *increased*, and if we take into the account the diminished degree of mortality in each, they are considerably so. It is to be observed also that in the neighbourhood of most of the places from which the registers are taken there is, what is called, a *county house of industry*, into which prodigious numbers of the poor are received, and there employed. In one of them alone, that of Ship Meadow, there are 96 persons from the towns of Beccles and Bungay; and the burials from it were last year 72. There are, if I am not mistaken, five of these houses

in the county; a circumstance which must have greatly lessened the number of the parochial *burials* and perhaps something even the *baptisms*. To which may be added that the *country* parishes in the above list, notwithstanding all obstructions, appear, exactly conformable to the 18 Suffolk parishes in Mr. WALES's tables, pages 55 and 59, to be increased one third. Upon the whole therefore we may fairly conclude that this county, upon an average, is advanced between a third and a fourth in its population since the revolution.*

Let us now go into Norfolk, of the depopulation of which I have heard strange accounts; but we shall find them just as consonant to truth as the idea of the depopulation of the kingdom at large. Before I give the reader the evidence of fact for
this

* This idea might perhaps be confirmed by the very ingenious papers already alluded to of Mr. ARTHUR YOUNG; a writer to whom this country is singularly indebted for his many valuable publications. It appears by register extracts he has made in 14 parishes in this county for two periods of 90 years each, the one directly before the revolution, the other almost immediately subsequent, that the number of christenings in the latter were nearly 1-8th more than in the former; and that the excess of the baptisms over the burials was as 3 to 1 in favour of the present century. To shew that this increase of population is not confined to this long period he forms a comparison between the last thirty years and the thirty preceding. The christenings of the latter period surpassed those of the former 1-10th, and the increase of the baptisms over the burials was more than *doubled*. From whence he concludes that the rapid rise of our population has been in the last thirty years; for that there can scarcely be a part of the kingdom where this can be less attributed to any but general causes operating through the whole of it than in the parishes in which his extracts were made

this purpose, as deduced from the register extracts of the county, I beg leave to present him with the opinion of a native of it, in all respects well qualified to judge in this matter. It is contained in a letter with which he has favoured me, together with much other useful intelligence; "As I am a native of the county, says this ingenious correspondent, and have always resided in the center of it, except seven years spent at Cambridge, having passed, saving that exception, 54 years in it, I am by no means a stranger to its general state, and think myself well assured to say, that the county of Norfolk at large, was never in a more populous and flourishing state than of late years, or at present. In several parts many extensive commons and waste lands have been inclosed and are now inclosing amongst us, and the spirit of agriculture and cultivation is very high and alert, where the pressures of the times have not yet extended their effects, and where the means yet remain to persevere in the improvement of our lands."

This gentleman, I flatter myself, will not be displeased to see the probable confirmation of his opinion in the following register extracts.

N O R F O L K.

		First Period.		Second Period.	
Parishes		Bapt.	Bur.	Bapt.	Bur.
Shipdam	— —	608	463	669	499
Catton	— —	197	159	304	251
Thorpe	— —	185	198	178	178
Trower Newton	—	378	331	396	290
Lakenham	— —	89	86	164	109
Kirby Bedon	—	127	101	160	123
Sweinſthorpe	—	50	61	49	62
Altcar	— —	246	148	182	137
Helleſdon	— —	56	44	63	52
Drayton	— —	142	98	167	127
White-Gate	—	386	212	351	223
Hedenham	— —	121	87	179	109
Dereham	— —	1198	941	1724	1251
Ellingham	— —	102	80	99	64
Laddon	— —	427	334	407	296
Brome	— —	101	61	106	64
Detchingham	—	172	155	259	175
		4545	3559	5448	4010*

From these extracts it appears that, as far as their evidence goes, the county is increased at least one fifth in its population, exclusive of the addition to be made from the degree of diminished mortality.

A

* This disparity between the baptisms and burials is partly owing to the county houses of industry.

A most obliging and active correspondent in the city of Norwich, not only furnished me with a considerable part of the above register extracts, but likewise sent me the bills of mortality for the city of Norwich for these last 20 years. These bills are much more satisfactory than those of London, as they contain the births and burials of all denominations. Unfortunately however they go no farther back than the year 1729. Their annual number of baptisms and burials then and now are as follows.

	Bapt.	Bur.
In 1729 — — — — —	877	1136
On an average of 5 years, beginning with the year 1775, }	1157	1176

From this increase of the baptisms the population of the city appears to have advanced one fourth even since the year 1729.

But the augmentation of inhabitants is not the most pleasing intelligence conveyed by these bills. The degree of its mortality is greatly diminished. In the year 1729 the baptisms were but 3-4ths of the burials; whereas on an average of five years ending with the year 1780, they were very nearly equal. Consequently the actual living population must be augmented much more than I have just now said. This advantageous change in point of healthiness my correspondent, in some measure, ascribes three, and with great plausibility, to two causes.

The first is, the amazing increase of vegetation within the walls of the city during the course of the last thirty or forty years; infomuch, he supposes, that it now contains more garden ground than any city in the kingdom. The second cause of increased healthiness is the building many small houses on the *out-side* of the city for poor people, who used to be cooped up in some confined holes *within*. Should improvements for this purpose be carried still further in the city of Norwich, and particularly should it adopt the humane regulations respecting the infant poor of the cities of London and Westminster, it would become, perhaps, in point of salubrity, little if at all inferior to the healthiest of country parishes. It seems indeed scarcely less so even at present. In the year 1752 a survey was taken of the city, when the inhabitants amounted to upwards of 36000, which, I am assured, was far below the truth. The annual burials were about 11000 which shews the average of deaths to be about one in thirty-three. Its healthiness is greatly increased since that time; what would it be, then, were every remaining unfavourable circumstance removed?

It appears then to be the joint result of the above remarks, that the population of this county at large, must like its neighbours have increased more than one fourth since the revolution.

I shall now just take a slight view of the midland counties and then proceed to the north.

M I D D L E S E X.

Parishes.	First Period.		Second Period.	
	Bapt.	Bur.	Bapt.	Bur.
Fulham — —	1484	1640	1793	2531
Chelsea — —	1109	1347	2720	4746
Chiswick — —	967	1286	1715	2354
Kensington —	1734	2514	2419	3571
Highgate — —	591	219	768	304
Illeworth —	1213	1342	1960	2198
Twickenham —	971	930	1406	1521
Kentish Town	539	1281	809	6263
	8558	10559	13690	23487

N O R T H A M P T O N.

St. John, Peterborou.	2361	2369	2234	2528
Northampton —	—	—	—	—
— All Saints —	1762	1459	1914	2090
— St. Sepulchre	437	375	635	788
— St. Giles —	505	478	605	707
— St. Peter —	85	150	129	211
Orlingbury — —	100	49	180	143
Willingborough —	1582	1677	1433	1596
Eaton — — —	207	164	188	168
Finedon — —	414	292	467	407
Kingsthorpe —	308	264	375	413
Kislingbury —	167	187	248	211
	5628	5095	6174	6742

HUNT.

HUNTINGDON.

Parishes.	First Period.		Second Period.	
	Bapt.	Bur.	Bapt.	Bur.
Huntingdon - —	881	805	937	908
Whittlesea - —	2488	2044	2847	2526
Conington - —	76	54	81	64
Stilton — —	270	234	313	237
Glatton — —	228	180	261	246
	3943	3317	4439	3981

CAMBRIDGE.

Ely, St. Trinity —	1744	1800	1757	1591
— Mary —	800	608	840	695
Cam. St. Mary —	315	401	302	295
— Harston —	173	135	243	188
	3032	2944	3142	2959

HERTFORD.

Bishops Stortford —	1068	741	1085	1034
Sawbridgeworth —	643	530	790	703
Tring — —	541	619	894	1016
Hempstead — —	751	768	1326	1436
Berkhampstead — —	479	529	893	967
Watford — —	1291	1292	1901	1736
	4773	4479	5889	5892

LEI-

L E I C E S T E R.

Parishes	First Period.		Second Period.	
	Bapt.	Bur.	Bapt.	Bur.
Leiceſt. St. Martin's	1052	963	1452	1538
———— Mary's	583	498	1932	1847
———— Nicholas	282	—	355	—
Wegſtone — —	403	—	610	—
	2320	1461	4349	3385

S T A F F O R D.

Abbot's Bromley	745	655	852	646
Cheadle — —	425	394	681	665
Womborne — —	341	179	586	383
Hanbury — —	433	472	485	476
	1944	1700	2604	2170

S . A L O P.

Drayton — —	1239	1223	1691	1130
Audlem — —	804	643	1101	618
Shrewſbury, St. Mary's	781	740	1134	1312
Wellington — —	1474	291	2983	1841
Berrington —	110	110	252	167
	4408	3007	7161	5068

B E R K S.

Newbury — —	2237	2119	2384	2230
Speen — —	614	445	795	741
	2851	2564	3179	2971

DERBY

BUCKS, DERBY, AND OXFORD.

Parishes.	First Period.		Second Period.	
	Bapt.	Bur.	Bapt.	Bur.
Bucks. Amersham	784	740	1222	1084
— Chesham	964	1394	1730	1951
Oxford. St. Mary	318	345	176	179
— St. Thomas	702	602	642	623
— Drayton	93	39	129	64
Derby. Eggerton	134	129	168	103
— Etwall —	180	131	191	149
— Mickleover	178	130	237	153
— Little-over Chapelry	86	66	173	87
— Fendern ditto	85	83	109	105
— Sutton on the Hill	166	159	229	144
— Norbury	127	112	187	115
	3817	3930	5196	4767

Judging from these extracts, the midland counties, like those of the east, west, and south, are increased about one fourth:

PARISH

PARISHES IN WALES FOR TWO PERIODS OF
TWELVE YEARS EACH.

Parishes.	First Period.		Second Period.	
	Bapt.	Bur.	Bapt.	Bur.
Llanfhaiddan —	428	412	538	422
Geffillios —	262	214	285	176
Llanbedn —	137	82	138	72
Llanfwroy —	300	295	416	235
Henlan —	275	231	431	323
	1402	1234	1808	1228

These Welch parishes, estimating by the baptisms, are increased almost one third, by the burials scarcely at all. Neither, perhaps, is the exact truth. The great excess of the former over the latter, cannot be owing intirely to their healthiness, but probably, in a great measure, to their emigrations into England; while the remaining population is doubtless considerably increased.

Let us now travel to the north, and we shall there find population advanced still faster than any thing we have yet met with.

Y O R K.

Parishes.		First Period		Second Period.	
		Bapt.	Bur.	Bapt.	Bur.
Leeds	— —	5392	6334	7312	7983
Bingley	— —	1153	973	2178	1724
Warmfield cum Heath	}	326	238	413	309
Whitchurch	—	797	660	1079	557
Thorparc	— —	132	138	164	98
Berwick in Elmet		481	397	610	388
Dewsbury near Wakefield	}	1507	1304	4255	2681
Marlton	— —	173	143	343	189
Kighly	— —	906	723	2888	2026
Tadcaster	— —	585	414	1028	728
Hinckley	— —	1841	658	1132	1564
Knareborough	—	1225	1190	2263	1958
Wycliffe	— —	21	25	41	49
Middleton Tyas	—	216	183	485	299
Total		13755	13380	24191	20293

LANCASTER.

Parishes.	First Period.		Second Period.	
	Bapt.	Bur.	Bapt.	Bur.
Walton — —	475	1121	788	1699
Stalmin — —	528	560	633	462
Bolton in the Moors	2773	2891	6411	5357
Prescot — —	1367	1276	3124	3225
Rochdale — —	4377	3849	8960	7730
Leigh — —	1960	1666	4235	2591
Sephton — —	564	958	655	850
Prestwich — —	979	817	2440	2223
Middleton — —	1052	906	3233	2065
Hayton — —	732	498	1082	756
Ratcliffe — —	481	360	1459	947
Bury — —	1693	1793	9339	4833
Dean — —	1560	1816	2862	2316
Flixton — —	776	450	1097	768
Farnworth — —	957	1039	1387	1122
Ecclelston — —	126	83	164	145
Total	18389	19583	47919	37195

CUMBERLAND

C U M B E R L A N D.

Parishes	First Period.		Second Period.	
	Bapt.	Bur.	Bapt.	Bur.
Deftington —	177	138	349	235
Dean — —	300	254	384	270
Workington —	461	341	2113	1586
Egremont — —	320	283	599	388
Arlerdon — —	293	138	222	105
Bees — — —	873	518	1255	338
Total	2324	1672	5921	2922

C H E S T E R.

Hale Chapel —	399	339	620	342
Childwall — —	680	722	1094	1276
Ashton upon Mersey	316	276	803	545
Burton — —	183	198	311	284
Presbury — —	6194	5456	13019	7075
Waverham —	544	501	1032	727
St. Michael, Chester	316	317	326	245
Knutsford —	476	656	1072	1008
Ravensthorpe —	366	382	540	353
Total	9474	8847	18317	11875

As far as the register extracts of these 45 places will enable us to judge the population of the northern counties, whether we compute by baptisms or burials, or by a union of both; whether we view

view them separately or collectively, their population seems to be even more than doubled. And this estimation is strongly confirmed by the register returns of the diocese of Chester, comprehending near *four hundred parishes*, in the year 1717 and 1779. I will not trouble the reader with a detail of the several parishes in them, although I have seen the numbers of each, but only present him with the return and increase of each separate deanry.

REGISTER RETURNS *for the Diocese of*
CHESTER, *in the Years 1777 and 1779; with*
the INCREASE of each DEANRY.

ARCHDEACONRY OF CHESTER.

Deanries.	1717.		1779.		Increase.	
	Bapt.	Bur.	Bapt.	Bur.	Bapt.	Bur.
Bangor — —	88	76	148	112	60	36
Blackburn — —	719	645	1604	1019	885	374
Chester — —	608	446	838	711	230	265
Frodsham — —	649	501	1124	741	475	240
Leyland — —	355	285	586	397	231	112
Macclesfield — —	564	661	961	799	397	138
Malpas — —	144	98	263	146	119	48
Manchester — —	1875	1492	5816	3916	3941	2424
Middlewich — —	404	325	713	500	309	175
Nantwich — —	376	320	618	447	242	127
Warrington, east part	709	521	1518	1267	809	746
— west part	933	849	2217	2242	1284	1393
Wirral — —	279	161	385	276	106	115
Total	7703	6380	16791	12573	9088	6193
	K		ARCH-			

ARCHDEACONRY of RICHMOND.

		1717.		1779.		Increase.	
Deanries		Bapt.	Bur.	Bapt.	Bur.	Bapt.	Bur.
Amounderness	—	657	653	1091	945	435	292
Furness	—	284	203	372	265	78	62
Copeland	—	409	310	836	680	427	270
Kendal	—	226	253	591	419	365	166
Lonsdale	—	301	265	498	276	197	11
Richmond	—	435	321	644	346	209	75
Catterick	—	405	348	365	361	100	13
Borough Bridge		184	122	275	215	91	93
Total		2901	2375	4672	3507	1902	982

In the whole } 10604-8755 21463 16080-10990-7175
diocese }

Dr. PRICE says, p. 15 of his essay on the population of England and Wales, that 35 is by no means too great a multiplier of the annual deaths in *France* to shew its population. If he allows me the same multiplier for *England*, as I hope he will, the above deanries in the course of about 60 years, are increased 251125 souls. If he grants me 26 only as a multiplier of the *baptisms*, which is less than he allows for *France*, the increase is 285740. Let the Doctor produce a parallel instance in any province of *France*, *Spain*, *Italy*, or in any kingdom in *Europe*. The generality of *Auvergne* in *France* seems the most increased of any part of that nation; but what does that amount to? In

th

the same compass of time it was advanced in its annual baptisms from 5681 to 6893 ; at most about 1-5th, whereas the above *British provinces*, have been more than *doubled*.

But even this, great as it is, is not the only agreeable deduction from these returns. Dr. PRICE observes, page 31 of his essay, " That from Mr. Moheau's *Recherches & Considerations sur la Population de la France* it appears that on an average of five years ending in 1774, the births of that kingdom exceeded the deaths a *seventh* ; and that this is probably an excess which in *France* more than counter balances the destruction occasioned by emigration, war, and the sea-service." How does this matter stand with us ? From the above returns it appears that the births exceed the burials more than a *fifth*, even exclusive of the *dissenters* ; whom one of themselves, Mr. Robinson, (if I remember right) estimates at a *fifth* of the whole inhabitants of the kingdom. However as this estimate is not to be depended upon, it being founded on principles extremely fallacious, I will only suppose them to be one *twentieth*, which will make the excess of our births over our burials, near a *fourth* ; and this is probably an excess, which in *England* more than counter balances the destruction occasioned by *emigration, war, and the sea-service*, however great they may be above those of *France*.

S E C T. II.

Collective View of the Register Evidence.

HAVING travelled over the greater part of the kingdom, and seen population increased wherever we went, with the exception of not one place in twenty, let us take a survey of the whole in one collective view, according to their annual average of births and burials, as exhibited in the following table, together with those from Mr. WALES.

T A B L E.

Counties.	Parishes.	No. of	First Period.		Second Period.	
			Births.	Burials.	Births.	Burials.
Kent	—	64	1729,70	1730,50	2285,60	2166,90
Essex	—	43	877,90	942,30	1068,85	1125,95
Suffex	—	18	185,45	167,45	281,35	176,45
Surrey	—	17	385,45	382,05	593,00	690,05
5 S. Counties	16		388,30	367,30	739,15	695,80
Suffolk	—	29	698,45	681,15	632,95	729,70
Cy of Norwich			877,00	1136,00	1157,00	1176,00
Norfolk	—	17	229,25	177,45	272,40	200,50
12 Mid. Coun.	61		2063,70	1952,80	2841,00	3111,01
D. of Chester			10604,00	8755,00	21463,00	16080,00
In Wales	—	5	116,80	102,60	150,60	102,00
Mr. Wales's	38		1807,24	1518,24	5384,68	3537,62
D. of St. David			1228,90	1077,70	2029,60	1663,60
Total			21192,14	19090,54	38899,18	31455,58

If we estimate the mean number of inhabitants at the two periods by the baptisms, those of the latter will be to the former as 38899 to 21192 or as nearly as 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ to 1. If the deaths be considered as the standard, the proportion will be as 31455 to 19090, or something more than 3 to 2. Should we calculate by an arithmetical mean arising from a combination of both, it will be nearly as 35177 to 20141, or about 7 to 4. But perhaps this is much too low to represent the proportion which our inhabitants bear to those at the revolution. The first period for the diocese of Chester does not begin till about thirty years after, and that for the diocese of St. David not till twelve. Taking all this into consideration, together with the diminished degree of mortality which has certainly taken place, there cannot a doubt remain that our people are almost *doubled* since that celebrated æra.

Even granting that we have taken too great a share of our register evidence from the north, that most growing and populous part of our community; the deduction to be made on that account, will hardly, it is presumed, reduce the increase to one third. It has, I think, been pretty clearly proved that our metropolis itself is augmented in that ratio; and Mr. RUDDER, by a minute detail of its several parishes, has shewn that the whole county of Gloucester has raised its numbers, even

since the commencement of the present century, from about 105,000 to almost 150,000. But however rich and flourishing that county may be, there is not the least ground of probability to suppose that it has increased faster than the kingdom at large, even exclusive of those prodigious multitudes in the northern provinces. Upon every view, therefore, we may safely venture to conclude that our population, since the distinguished æra we have occasion so often to mention, is, upon the whole, and comprehending every part of our island, increased full one *third*.

I have omitted to insert the registers before given for the northern counties, because the greater part of them are in the diocese of Chester; and those in the environs of London, because comprehended in Essex, Middlesex, Surrey, and Kent.

S E C T. III.

Increase of Population during the last twenty Years.

THE great advance population has made amongst us since the revolution, being, as I apprehend, sufficiently proved, I shall endeavour to ascertain which way it has gone during the last twenty years. Dr. PRICE says it has more rapidly declined than ever. How little foundation he has for this opinion the following table will pretty clearly shew. It contains the number of baptisms and burials in about 161 of the above parishes

parishes and those of the city of Norwich, for two periods of five years each, the first beginning with the year 1758, 60 or 61, the second with the year 1773, 5 or 6. These two periods seem as proper and unexceptionable for our purpose as any that can be thought of. In each of them the kingdom was deep in a war very expensive in human blood, and the degree of mortality, in other respect, has not been greatly altered.

T A B L E.

Counties	No. of Parishes,	First Period.		Second Per.	
		Bap.	Bur.	Bap.	Bur.
Kent ———	— 22	3844	3784	4589	3778
Essex ———	— 24	3630	4068	4503	4385
Suffex ———	— 4	384	374	425	257
Surrey ———	— 9	1834	2139	2296	2094
Suffolk ———	— 3	272	297	280	216
Norfolk ———	— 16	5836	6800	6762	6465
4 S. West Counties	7	3145	3226	3613	3597
12 Middle Counties	40	12133	16662	14216	17263
4 Northern Counties	37	16560	12204	22883	14975
Total		162	47638	49554	59567
			53030		

Here then, in the short interval of ten years, is an additional population computing by the baptisms of 1-5th, by the burials of 1-11th, and by a union of both of more than 1-8th. Consequently instead of having more rapidly declined during the last twenty years it has advanced much faster than before.

While there has been this rapid advance in the kingdom at large, that of particular places has been altogether astonishing, and affords a pleasing exception to the general remark so often made in the course of these papers that country parishes have increased more than great towns, Liverpool in the year 1700 had not 6000 inhabitants, in 1760 it had more than 25000, in 1770 upwards of 34000, and, what is more directly to our point, it now contains above 40000. Birmingham has risen in the course of the present century from little more than a mere manufacturing village, to a town of prodigious magnitude; and, what is particularly surprizing, it has added 10000 to its numbers within the last ten years. Sheffield, judging from register extracts alone, which for reasons already adduced doubtless represent the matter inferior to the fact, has multiplied its people six times since the year 1734. Halifax, Bradford, Wakefield, Huddersfield, Rotherham, Manchester, Middleton, Rochdale, Warrington, Whitehaven, Workington, and innumerable others, have grown nearly in the same proportion. But a town called Mary Port, in Cumberland has, methinks, outstript them all. Within thirty years it has sprung as it were from nothing. In the year 1749 it had only a single house; and it did not even receive its *name* till the year 1756; and now, by an actual enumeration very lately finished, its numbers exceed 2000, exclusive of those employed upon the sea.

Perfect

Perfectly similar to the above detail is the account I have just received from the city of Carlisle. In 1763, the inhabitants were numbered, with great care and attention, and they were found to be only 4158. In January 1780, a very careful and accurate survey was again made and they amounted to 6299. "This astonishing increase of 2141 inhabitants, which is above half of the original number, in the small space of seventeen-years, says the ingenious writer of the account, has taken place during that very period in which Dr. PRICE asserts the depopulation of Great-Britain to have been rapid and progressive. And what makes this increase more remarkable, Carlisle has, during the whole period alluded to, been constantly supplying the army, the navy, the metropolis, and even the distant regions of India with her hardy, active, and enterprising sons."* I leave these remarks with the reader.—They are decisive and require no comment.

SECT.

* Observations on the bills of mortality of the city of Carlisle, 1780.

S E C T. IV.

Comparative View of the Advance of Population in ENGLAND and FRANCE.

DR. PRICE observes p. 30, " That our de-
 " population is the more mortifying, be-
 " cause it seems, in some degree, peculiar
 " to this nation." Leaving those who chuse to be-
 lieve the gloomy suggestions of groundless appre-
 hension to *mortify* as much, and as long as they
 think proper, I shall, for my own part, freely
 indulge the *luxury*, as it is presumed every Eng-
 lishman will permit me to call it, of contem-
 plating the *facts* represented in the following tables.
 They exhibit the growth of population in Eng-
 land and France during the space of sixty years
 since the commencement of the present century.

FRANCE

F R A N C E.

In several PROVINCES and GENERALITIES according to the REGISTERS of BIRTHS.

	Par.				1st P.	2d P.
Auvergne	162	increased from	—	—	1 to	1,211
Rouen	541	—	—	—	1 to	1,011
Lyon	133	—	—	—	1 to	1,167
Vaifon	38	—	—	—	1 to	1,156
Burgundy	1278	—	—	—	1 to	1,081

PRINCIPAL TOWNS *and* CITIES.

Paris	—	—	—	—	1 to	1,131
Lyon	—	—	—	—	1 to	1,093
Rouen	—	—	—	—	1 to	0,927
Marseilles	—	—	—	—	1 to	0,929
Vitry	—	—	—	—	1 to	0,600
Toulon	—	—	—	—	1 to	0,750
Aix	—	—	—	—	1 to	0,831
Montaban	—	—	—	—	1 to	0,991
Carcassonne	—	—	—	—	1 to	1,056

E N G L A N D.

In different DIOCESES and COUNTIES.

Chester, archdeaconry,—from	—	1 to	2,177
Richmond ditto	—	1 to	1,672
St. David's diocese, <i>in Wales</i>	—	1 to	1,660
Thirty-eight parishes from Mr. Wales	1 to	2,924	
Suffex, Surrey, Kent and the middle counties	}	1 to	1,374

P R I N-

PRINCIPAL TOWNS *and* CITIES.

London, according to its burials, from	1	to	1,500
Norwich, its births	—	—	1 to 1,391
Liverpool, actual surveys	—	—	1 to 6,000
Manchester, from its births	—	—	1 to 3,769
Sheffield, births	—	—	1 to 6,307
Whitehaven, from surveys	—	—	1 to 5,000
Workington, births	—	—	1 to 4,583
Walsall	—	—	1 to 3,247
Middleton	—	—	1 to 4,090
Rochdale	—	—	1 to 3,061
Warrington	—	—	1 to 2,406

From these tables it is obvious, on the very slightest inspection, that the provinces and generalities of France are increased only a *tenth*; whereas the counties and dioceses of England and Wales are almost *doubled*; that the metropolis of the former is enlarged something more than an *eighth*, that of the latter above a *third*; that the cities and towns of inferior rank in the former are rather *diminished*, while those of Britain are multiplied almost *four times*.

S E C T. V.

The present amount of our Population computed.

HAVING as I hope pretty clearly established the doctrine of an increased and increasing population, I shall now try what can be done towards ascertaining its present actual amount. Two modes seem to me tolerably satisfactory for that purpose.

1st. The average proportion which the houses returned by the window surveyors to the tax-office bear to those that are *not* returned there : and the

2d. The average proportion which the number of men ballotted into the triennial service of the national militia in a great number of places of all kinds and descriptions taken at random bears to the whole number of inhabitants in those places collectively.

From

From the Returns of Houses at the Tax-Office.

WITH regard to the returns, it has been fully proved that *all* the houses are not returned there; that for great towns it is impossible, and that for country parishes it is commonly *guessed* at; our business then, is to determine the deficiencies arising from all these several quarters. This may be done, if not with perfect accuracy, with at least a high degree of probability, by taking indiscriminately the surveyors' returns of a great number of places of all sorts, sizes, and descriptions, and comparing them with the total number of houses, determined by actual enumeration, in such places respectively, and collecting from thence their joint average ratio. In order to see how this matter really stands, I must beg the reader to consult the following table.

TABLE.

TABLE shewing the Number of Houses returned by the Surveyors of the Window Lights, in different Towns and Parishes in different Parts of the Kingdom taken indiscriminately; together with the total Number of Houses taken from actual Enumeration, in such Towns and Parishes respectively.

T A B L E.			
Counties.	Parishes.	Houses returned. Total.	
Berks	Speen	187	240
	Newbury	739	792
Chester	Prestbury	1366	2066
	Burton	41	95
	Chester	1227	2883
	Eastham	116	213
Cornwall	St. Kevern	155	418
Cambridge	Little St. Mary's	77	90
Devon	Torrington	204	304
	Newton Ferrers	44	104
	Holfworthy	114	155
Dorset	Derweston	18	65
	Shillingston	35	72
Essex	Stebbing	72	201
	Witham	244	400
	Redgwell	25	85
	High Ongar	50	60
	Gosfield	25	73
	High Roding	41	63

Counties

Counties.	Parishes.	Houses returned	Total.
	Braintree	— 95	445
Hants	Portsea	— 1540	1940
Hertford	Bishops Stortford	— 200	226
Lancaster	Rainford	— 102	221
	Manchester	— 2889	4268
Norfolk	Helfden	— 6	27
	Drayton	— 19	54
	Trower Newton	— 19	84
	Lakenham	— 29	88
	Catton	— 46	123
	Thorpe	— 27	57
	Kirby Bedon	— 20	30
	Sweinſthorpe	— 11	20
	Minſhull	— 36	55
	Thwaite	— 8	12
	Hedenham	— 23	63
Northampton	Northampton	— 768	1086
Salop	Shrewsbury	— 967	1884
	Wartling	— 55	79
Suffolk	Bungay	— 260	338
	Weston	— 12	23
	Beccles	— 169	465
	Haverhill	— 56	146
	Bardwell	— 37	49
	Ixworth	— 86	90
	Hawſted	— 33	60
	Fulham	— 355	537
Suffex	Hertsmonceux	— 54	91
	Brightling	— 38	80

Catsfield

Counties,	Parishes.	Houses returned.	Total.
Surrey	Catsfield — —	23	50
	Epsom — —	215	345
	Albury — —	48	75
Stafford	Abbots Bromley	161	246
Worcester	Old Swinford	414	1579
York	Thorparch —	41	58
	Middleton Tyas	71	155
	—	—	—
Kent	Maidstone —	623	1106
	Marden — —	186	225
	Boughton —	57	87
	Tudely — —	56	83
	Sutton near Dartford	103	104
	Tenterden —	96	198
	Crayford —	170	190
	Lenham — —	153	194
	Wouldham —	9	38
	Burham — —	15	24
	Teston — —	26	26
	East Malling	175	175
	Addington —	5	29
	Sutton on the Hill	17	102
	Wellington —	20	49
Derby	Etwall — —	30	99
	Eggington —	28	54
	Mickleover —	42	76
	Little-over —	33	44
	Findern — —	28	45
	Great Saling —	21	54
	Bardfield Saling	22	43
	—	—	—
Effex	—	—	—

L

Herts

Counties.	Parishes.	Houses returned.	Total.
Herts	Berkhamstead	166	242
	Tring	107	157
Middlesex	Fulham	355	537
	HammerSmith	384	567
Norfolk	Rednall with Harlston	89	157
	Brome	19	31
	Loddon	69	139
	Brooke	34	78
	Ditchingham	29	44
Northampton	Eaton	20	95
	Killingbury	32	107
	Kingsthorpe	63	151
	Finedon	85	177
Leicester	Scraptoft	14	28
Suffolk	Ship Meadow	7	13
	Mettingham	21	22
	St. Andrew, Ilkshall	45	56
	Ellingham	25	39
	Homersfield	21	34
	St. Peter's	12	14
Total		17225	29261

By this table it appears that the number of houses returned for these towns and parishes are 17225, but that the total number is 29261, and methinks here is a sufficient number and variety of each kind to form an average proportion for the

the whole kingdom. This allowed, the number of houses returned to the tax-office is to the total number of houses in the kingdom, and as 17225 to 29261.

But this, it must be granted, holds good only for the year 1780; whereas the last return Dr. PRICE gives us is for 1777. The returns in 1780, supposing them made, must have been something less, for reasons sufficiently apparent in the course of this work. This difference must be made out by a comparison of successive returns at the tax-office, in different years, at a given interval from each other. Now the houses returned in the year 1777 were 27958 less than in the year 1761; which shews the average annual decrease in the returns during these 16 years was 1747. This multiplied by 3 the number of years from 1777 to 1780 (the latter inclusive) gives 5241 the further decrease to the last period, which subtracted from 952734 the number of houses returned in 1777 leaves 947493, the true return for 1780. Resume then the number of houses in the abovementioned towns and parishes, both total and returned and say as

the number of houses returned for all these	17225
places is to their total number	— 29261
so is the number of houses returned at	
the tax-office in 1780	— 947493
to the total num. of houses in the kingdom	1,609,555

We have nothing further to do than to ascertain the average allowance of persons to a house, and we see our present actual population. What this average is may be satisfactorily collected from the following table.

TABLE SHEWING THE NUMBER OF PERSONS
TO A HOUSE.

Counties	Parishes.	Houses.	Inhabit.	To a Ho.
Chester	Burton —	95	448	4 $\frac{3}{4}$
	Eastham	212	1084	5 $\frac{1}{9}$
	Chester —	2883	14713	5 $\frac{1}{10}$
Cornwall	St. Keverne	418	1688	4 $\frac{1}{2}$
Devon	Newton Ferrers	104	464	4 $\frac{1}{2}$
Essex	Toppesfield	105	624	6
	L. Baddow	64	352	5 $\frac{1}{3}$
Kent	Maidstone	1106	5650	5 $\frac{1}{9}$
	Marden	225	1173	5 $\frac{1}{5}$
	Farningham	56	280	5
	Boughton	87	495	5 $\frac{2}{3}$
	Telfon —	26	145	5 $\frac{1}{2}$
	Tunstall —	17	115	6 $\frac{1}{2}$
Lancaster	Manchester	4268	27246	6 $\frac{1}{4}$
	Liverpool	6346	34407	5 $\frac{2}{5}$
	Rainford	221	961	4 $\frac{1}{3}$
Norfolk	Norwich	7139	36169	5 $\frac{1}{9}$
	Brooke	78	489	6 $\frac{1}{4}$
	Thorpe	57	272	4 $\frac{3}{4}$
Nottingham	Nottingham	3267	17417	5 $\frac{1}{3}$
				Suffolk

Counties	Parishes.	Houses.	Inhabit.	Total	Hot
Suffolk	Hawsted	50	386	7 $\frac{1}{2}$	
	*Bradfield	22	125	5 $\frac{1}{2}$	
	Combust				
	*Great Wald	34	263	7 $\frac{25}{34}$	
	ingfield				
	*Lowstoft	445	2231	5	
	Haverhill	146	1076	7 $\frac{1}{3}$	
Suffex	Catsfield	50	290	5 $\frac{4}{5}$	
	Hooe	49	380	7 $\frac{1}{3}$	
	Brightling	80	448	5 $\frac{1}{2}$	
	Penhurst	10	74	7 $\frac{1}{4}$	
Warwick	Birmingham	6025	30804	5 $\frac{1}{5}$	
	in 1770				
Cumberland	†Carlisle	891	6299	7 $\frac{1}{4}$	
	†Newtown	16	92	5 $\frac{3}{4}$	
	†Harraby	9	72	8	
	†Carleton	30	133	4 $\frac{1}{2}$	
	†Wreay	17	114	6 $\frac{1}{4}$	
	†Brisco	32	192	6	
	†Botchardby	21	98	4 $\frac{2}{3}$	
	†Uprightby	20	89	4 $\frac{1}{2}$	
	†Bleckhill	63	354	5 $\frac{1}{3}$	
	†Cummerdale	22	110	5	
	†Morten Hd	27	124	4 $\frac{1}{2}$	
	& Newby				
Northampton	Killingbury	107	473	4 $\frac{1}{2}$	
Total		34934	188419	5 $\frac{1}{5}$	

L 3

From

Those places mark'd * are from Mr. ARTHUR YOUNG;
those mark'd † from observations on the Carlisle bills of
mortality.

From this table then it appears that the average number of persons to a house is about $5\frac{1}{2}$. But in the city of London it is allowed on all hands that it must be considerably more. Mr. WALES makes it $6\frac{1}{2}$, and even Dr. PRICE seems not very unwilling to allow 6. This last number then we may safely venture to take. The city of London is nearly 1-10th of the whole kingdom; consequently the average arising from the combination of town, and country, is very little less than $5\frac{1}{2}$. But lest the above table should not comprehend a sufficient number and variety of places to form a satisfactory average upon, and because I would chuse to represent our population as rather *below* the truth than *above* it. I will assume only $5\frac{1}{2}$.

Multiply then the number of houses 1,609,555 found above by $5\frac{1}{2}$ the average of persons to a house and the product is 8,691,597. If we consider the several deductions and abatements above made, and likewise bring to account the prodigious numbers hitherto unnoticed; such as our soldiers and sailors, the multitudes contained in our dock yards, in our hospitals, in our county work-houses, or places for the general reception and employment of the poor, it will pretty evidently appear that from this mode of computation the present inhabitants of England and Wales can be very little less than nine millions.

The Population of the Kingdom computed from the average Proportion which the number of Men ballotted for into the triennial Service of the national Militia, from a great number of Places, of every Size and Description, bears to the whole number of the People in those Places collectively.

IT must here be previously observed that the proportion which the men ballotted for into the militia bears to the whole number of inhabitants will vary according as the exemptions from that service are more or less numerous and according as the returns of those liable to serve are made with more or less accuracy. From both these causes it will be much greater in country parishes than in large populous towns. Clerks, apprentices, seamen, &c. are exempted, and these are chiefly resident in *large towns*. The returns of those *liable* to serve too must there be very deficient, on account of the many lodgers and temporary inhabitants, who though in the place to day will perhaps be absent to-morrow, nor can the officers appointed to make the returns so minutely direct their inquiries with respect to each individual as may be done in a thin and scattered neighbourhood. Here are scarcely any clerks, apprentices, seamen, itinerant temporary lodgers, &c, each man too is known to each, and every one is interested that none be excused who are really subject to be returned.

Hence the proportion of the men returned as liable to serve, or those ballotted into actual service for places of such different descriptions to the whole number of people in such places respectively must be extremely different. The first thing therefore to be ascertained is this different proportion.

How this matter stands in country parishes may be collected with some degree of probability from the following short table.

T A B L E.					
Counties		Parishes		Inhab.	Militia
Kent	—	Boughton	—	497	$2\frac{1}{2}$
		Hunton	—	432	2
		Wouldham	—	119	1
		Burham	—	107	1
		Tetton	—	145	$1\frac{1}{2}$
Essex		Toppesfield	—	624	3
		Stebbing	—	950	$4\frac{1}{2}$
Suffex	—	Brightling	—	448	3
Suffolk	—	Hawstead	—	386	2
Devon	—	Newton Ferrers	—	464	3
York	—	Marlton	—	526	2
Hants	—	Lawton	—	380	$1\frac{1}{2}$
Kent	—	E. Malling	—	953	5
		Addington	—	182	$\frac{1}{2}$
				6213	32

From this table it appears that the average proportion of the men ballotted into the national militia

litia in country parishes to their whole number of inhabitants is nearly as 1 to 194. What the proportion is in large populous towns of various denominations, the following lists will shew.

	No. of Inhab.	Militia
Leeds — — —	17121	45
Maidstone — — —	5650	26
Birmingham — — —	40000	109
Chester — — —	14713	40
Presbury — — —	16000	52
Norwich — — —	40000	151
Manchester — — —	41030	80
Liverpool — — —	40000	42
Bolton — — —	7000	9
	221514	554

The average proportion of militia in these towns to the whole number of inhabitants is as 1 to 399. The medium of this, and that of country parishes would shew the average for the whole kingdom, provided there were just as many inhabitants in towns as in the country. But this, perhaps, is not the case. Dr. PRICE, page 198, 2d. edit. of *Observations on Reverfionary Payments*, informs us from Sufmilch that the number of *country* to *town* inhabitants, in Pomerania, Brandenburg and some other kingdoms, is nearly as $3\frac{1}{2}$ to 1. But this proportion is by no means applicable to so rich, manufacturing, and commercial a nation as England, Upon looking over a return of houses made

made by the clergy of the archdeaconry of Chester in the year 1779, I find there are more than two-thirds of them from towns containing above 400 houses each ; which may properly be called rather *large* than *small* towns, as their inhabitants are probably between two and three thousand. In the county of Gloucester also, comprehending the city and county of Bristol, the inhabitants of large towns are almost twice as many, as those of the country. Our capital too contains as many people as the country inhabitants of five or six counties. Although therefore in some of our counties the *country* may be four times as many as the *town* inhabitants, I think I may safely venture to say that, on an average applied to the whole kingdom at large, the latter are at least half the number of the former. Consequently agreeable to the ratio of their respective quotas to the militia above ascertained, the towns furnish one quarter as many men as the country. How many then is the sum total furnished by both ; or rather that *would* be furnished if the militia laws uniformly extended to every place ? The number at present required to be raised is 30840. But the Tower Hamlets and all that part of the city of London which retain the privilege of raising the train-bands, and the tinnors of the counties of Devon and Cornwall, are exempted from this service. How many these exempted persons amount to and how many men they would furnish to the militia if these exemptions were removed, it is impossible to say with any

any degree of precision. I will suppose, however, and I think it will be allowed no extravagant supposition, that the latter would not be less than 2160. This would make the whole body of militia 33000. One fifth of these, or 6600, the above reasoning requires to be furnished by the *towns*; and the ratio of their militia, to their whole inhabitants is as 1 to 399, consequently 6600 multiplied by 399 gives 2,633400, the number of our inhabitants resident in large *towns*. This multiplied by 2 produces 5,266,800 the number of inhabitants in the *country*; which added to those in the *towns* makes 7,900,200 for the whole population of the kingdom.

That this calculation from the *militia*, like the former one from the *houses*, is rather *below* the truth is extremely probable. The county of Gloucester and the city and county of Bristol contain, as appears partly from actual surveys and partly from general estimates, little less than 300000 inhabitants. But they altogether furnish only 960 men to the militia. This would give more than 300 as a multiplier; which, assumed for the whole kingdom, would make our population amount to almost ten millions. But considering the vast size of Bristol, so much beyond that of any other city in the nation, except the capital, I dare not take so large an average. And yet when I reflect on the amazing increase, and present populousness of all the northern counties,

I am

I am inclined to think it is not much too great, and that we may safely admit the above estimates to be *below* rather than *above* our present numbers. This is strongly confirmed too by the list of register extracts before produced. If, as Dr. PRICE contends, the inhabitants of the kingdom at the revolution were six millions, they must at present, on the clear testimony of register evidence, even exclusive of the consideration of a diminished mortality, be fully equal to what is deduced from the foregoing computations.

CONCLUSION.

THE result of the whole enquiry does, I apprehend, afford the fairest grounds for concluding that upon every mode of investigation, and according to the most moderate estimate, the inhabitants of this kingdom must have been increased one third since the revolution, about one sixth during the last twenty years, and that their present amount cannot be less than between eight and nine millions.

A variety of collateral circumstances incline me to believe that all these computations are *below* the truth. Dr. PRICE himself acknowledges that 10,000 houses in and about London have been built within the last twenty years; to these I may add near 40,000 that have risen up in only about two thirds of the archdeaconry of Chester, since
[the

the year 1720. With regard to the vicinity of the town of Manchester, I can, on the authority of a clergyman of distinguished ingenuity and uncommon accuracy of remark in that quarter, venture to assert that the people there are multiplied *twenty fold* within these last thirty years. Wonderful as this may seem I can easily credit it after being informed, that in several parishes of that neighbourhood three or four new chapels of ease to the mother church have been erected within little more than that compass of time. In perfect agreement with this are the prodigious numbers which were a few years ago confirmed in that part of the kingdom. At the general confirmation for the diocese of Chester in 1778, the number of young persons confirmed amounted to above 37,000, and in the last for that of York to upwards of 75,000. And it is to be remembered that almost all these were between the ages of fourteen and eighteen; which description I have seldom found to comprehend above a twentieth, or even a twenty-fifth of the whole inhabitants in any place. If to these you add the papists and dissenters, which abound there more than in any other quarter, you will find in these two dioceses alone, nearly two thirds as many people as our celebrated calculator could discover in the whole kingdom. After viewing this unparalleled growth of population in these counties and a very considerable one in all the rest, we need not wonder that in the course of the last six or seven years, we have recruited our army

my and supplied our navy with more than two hundred and fifty thousand effective men. Had we been the poor depopulated nation that we have been taught to believe ourselves, these astonishing drains would have left us no hands to till the earth, to make our clothes and prepare our food. We must have been our own labourers, millers, and bakers, taylors and shoemakers, or have been naked and starved. But in fact this amazing multitude is scarcely missed from amongst us. The plough still goes briskly forward, our fields stand thick with corn, our workshops and manufactures are as yet but little thinned, and all ranks and orders are as well clothed and fed as ever.

All these circumstances taken together form a strong presumptive testimony in favour of a greatly increased population, and tend to corroborate the *positive proofs* of it, which have been adduced in the course of this essay, and on which the merits of the question must principally and ultimately rest. These proofs are (as the reader will recollect) the deficiencies in the London bills of mortality; the deficiencies in the returns of the surveyors of the house and window tax; the numbers serving in the militia compared with the whole number of inhabitants in the respective places and districts by which they are furnished, and the several tables of baptisms and burials in the two requisite periods, extracted from the registers of eight or nine hundred parishes.—If these evidences and
the

the arguments founded on them are admitted, they must effectually overthrow Dr. PRICE's system, and establish a very different, and, to every sincere lover of his country, a much more comfortable doctrine. And it is not, I hope, assuming too much, or transgressing the bounds of candour to suggest, that as the ingenious author has undoubtedly suffered the weakness of his spirits, or the strength of his prejudices to mislead his judgment, in estimating one *most important branch* of our national force, they may have given the same gloomy tinge to his representation of our other resources also; and that he may have been almost as much mistaken in the state of our finances as in the state of our population. At least, this consideration furnishes the strongest reason against admitting any of the principles, of what may be called his *political arithmetic*, without a thorough examination, or adopting any of his discouraging conclusions, without great caution and considerable deductions.

That this kingdom is at present in very critical circumstances; that our enemies are powerful and numerous; that our taxes are heavy, and our public debts and incumbrances great, it is impossible to deny. But whoever will allow himself to review with coolness, deliberation, and impartiality the *whole* of our situation both absolute and relative, will, I conceive, find reason to think that the picture which has been drawn of us, as an enfeebled,

feebled, impoverished, and utterly ruined and devoted people, is overcharged and exaggerated beyond all bounds of credibility and truth. We have in former times shewn ourselves greatly superior to France and Spain united. Since those times it appears that the population of England has advanced more than twice as fast as theirs. Scotland and Ireland, judging from the latest and best writers on the subject, have probably multiplied with almost the same rapidity. This addition of internal strength will, I trust, be more than a balance for the increased number of our external enemies. We have already made such efforts against them as have astonished all Europe; and there is little reason to doubt, but that with the blessing of providence upon our councils and our arms; with firmness in our governors, with intrepidity in our commanders by sea and land, and unanimity among ourselves, we shall be able to resist effectually the formidable confederacy that has been perfidiously formed against us; and that we shall neither want men, money, spirit, nor perseverance to continue the war into which we have been most unhappily and unwillingly drawn, till we can close it by that most desirable of all events, a safe and honourable peace.

The E N D.

A D D E N D A.

THE following Articles, which are much too important to be omitted, came not time enough to be arranged in their proper places.

REGISTER EXTRACTS.

Counties.	Parishes.	First Period.		Second Period.	
		Bapt.	Bur.	Bap.	Bur.
Berks.	Read.St.Giles	1301	1130	1649	1896
	—St.Mary	1115	1213	1320	1676
	—St.Laurence	1440	1330	1430	1699
	—Milton 10 yrs.	17	23	68	29
Bucks.	Wendover	715	660	781	714
	—Aylesbury	1261	1395	1764	1626
Northampton.	Towcester	878	803	913	908
	—Crick	277	207	574	498
Nottingham	St. Nicholas	809	686	1615	1946
	—St. Peter's	732	906	1312	1617
Oxford.	Witney	1488	1189	2361	1920
	—Drayton	69	49	86	77
	—Parflow 10 years				
	—Bampton	1189	859	1129	827
Salop.	Shrewsbu-ry, St. Chad	2302	2195	2625	2573
	—St. Julian	700	609	879	676
	—Rodington	112	87	157	60
Stafford.	Walfall	2036	1733	6575	5408
Total		16441	15074	25238	24150

A D D E N D A

	Baptisms	Burials.
First Period	16432	15074
Second Period	25238	24150
Increase	8806	9076

These *seventeen* parishes are increased by more than half of their original number; and on the most moderate estimate, have added near 15,000 to their inhabitants since the revolution. But the town and parish of Sheffield, as seems extremely probable from information I have just received from thence, has acquired an addition of almost 15,000 people during the last 13 years; and it also appears from the register extracts with which an ingenious and very obliging clergyman of that place has favoured me, that its annual average of baptisms 200 years ago was less than 100, whereas now it exceeds 1000.

H O U S E S.

Counties.	Parishes.	Houses returned.	Total.
Northampton	Towcester	—	157 395
Berks	Reading, St. Giles	189	653
	St. Mary	210	304
Bucks	Aylesbury	—	425 653
	Wendover	—	152 230
Stafford	Walsall	—	667 1600
		1800	3835
			Here

A D D E N D A:

Here, upon an average, not *half* the houses in these several places are returned. If I have misunderstood the information of any of my correspondents they will be kind enough to correct me.



A. D. D. N. D. A.

Here upon an average, not less the double in
the first year, and secondly, I have not
understand the information of any of the
London, but will be kind enough to send me



ADVERTISEMENT.

THE following paper, with the communication of which I have been favoured by a person of high rank and the most distinguished abilities, having come too late to be inserted in its proper place, I have given it intire to the reader, who will immediately see that it was drawn up by the hand of a master.

POPULATION

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE following paper, with the communication of which I have been favoured by a person of high rank and the most distinguished abilities, having come too late to be inserted in its proper place, I have given it entire to the reader, who will immediately see that it was drawn up by the hand of a master.



A P P E N D I X
TO THE
E X A M I N A T I O N
O F
D R . P R I C E ' S E S S A Y
O N
P O P U L A T I O N .

APPENDIX

TO THE

EXAMINATION

OF

DR. PRICE'S ESSAY



POSITION

A P P E N D I X.

Examination of Dr. PRICE's Argument for a decrease of People, deduced from a decrease of the hereditary and temporary Excise.

DR. PRICE has referred to the account of the produce of the hereditary and temporary excise as affording a strong evidence of his proposition, that the number of the people in England is considerably diminished since the revolution.

If an accurate account is taken of the amount of a tax upon an article of general consumption at two different periods, the comparison will afford a fair ground to judge of the relative numbers of the consumers; but, in stating such account it is necessary 1st, to take periods sufficiently long to exclude the operation of temporary or accidental causes. 2dly, to enquire whether all the circumstances attending the perception of the tax are the same in both periods.

Dr. PRICE has chosen to compare the average amount of the duties payable under the name of *hereditary and temporary excise* for three years ending in 1689, with the average amount of four

years ending in 1768; the result of which comparison he finds to be a diminution of at least 100,000 l. per annum.

It has been already shewn in the appendix to Mr. EDEN's letters to Lord Carlisle, that a very different conclusion would follow from a comparison of the average amount of other years during the same æra; but it may also be shewn with as much certainty as belongs to arguments of this nature, that upon a full and fair state of the evidence which the excise accounts afford, there arises a clear proof of an increasing population from the revolution to the year 1778, and it is believed that the two last years would confirm this inference.

A period of 18 years is sufficiently long to prevent any variation from seasons, or other temporary causes, that may affect consumption, and in order to avoid any errors that may arise from stating the amount of the sums paid upon this tax (which includes other articles besides malt liquor) it will be proper to state the quantity charged with the duty.

Strong Beer. Small ditto

For 18 years ending at
Midsummer 1701, the quantity of beer charged was on
an average — — 3,958,233--2,422,928

For 18 years ending at
Midsummer 1778 — — 4,132,857--1,815,275
The

The beer thus charged is not the whole quantity consumed, for that which is brewed for private use is not liable to the duty. No just comparison can therefore be made without some estimate of the extent of the private brewery in each of the two periods compared, for if it has been greater in the one period than in the other, the comparison would evidently lead to an erroneous conclusion as to the numbers of the consumers.

In the first period the duty saved by brewing at home was only 2s. 6d. per barrel of strong, and 6d. per barrel of small beer. In the latter period the duty amounts to 8s. upon the barrel of strong and 1s. 4d. upon the barrel of small beer; it seems therefore reasonable to suppose that the quantity made in the private brewery should have increased in the latter period, because the saving is a much more considerable inducement to undertake the trouble and risk of it. If this supposition is just we shall find the proof of it in an increase of the duties upon malt and hops, to which beer made for private consumption is equally liable with that made for sale.

A duty of 6d. per bushel upon malt was first imposed in the year 1697 and excepting the years 1700 and 1701 has been continued to the present time. In 1760 an additional duty of 3d. per bushel was imposed, of which an account is kept distinct from the old duty. A comparison of the
amount

amount of the old duty in the first 18 years and in the last 18 years is, in one respect, disadvantageous to the latter period, for an increase of duty has a tendency to diminish consumption, and it is supposed that the additional malt duty had occasioned the common brewer to make a larger use of other materials for increasing the strength of their beer.

			£.
The average produce of the 6d. per bushel on malt for the first 18 years is			584,206
In the last 18 years it is	—	—	653,190
The increase is	—	—	68,984

The duty on hops commenced in the year 1711, the average of the first 18 years is

—	—	—	54,229
---	---	---	--------

Of the last 18 years it is

—	—	—	76,025
---	---	---	--------

The increase is

—	—	—	21,796
---	---	---	--------

The increase upon the malt is more than the 1-9th part, that upon the hops is above 1-3d. But the latter period of this duty has a considerable advantage over the former, as it includes the duty on hops exported to Ireland; though the quantity of hops exported will by no means account for the difference between the increase of hops and malt, and something ought to be allowed for the facility of finding a cheap substitute for the malt, yet I shall

shall take the increase of the private brewery, to be no greater than what the malt duty proves it, viz. 1-gth since the beginning of this century.

But there are other circumstances to be taken into consideration before a fair comparison can be formed between the two periods for the purpose of ascertaining their relative population. The consumption of beer may be lessened by the introduction of some other beverage, without affording any argument that the number of the consumers is diminished, and it becomes necessary to inquire whether any other liquors are used in greater quantities in the one period than in the other?

Wine, cyder, spirits and tea, may each of them in some degree supply the place of beer.

Wine, being an high priced commodity, and the duty upon cyder not having been imposed upon the maker, except from 1763 to 1767, during which period the amount was very considerable, no estimate of these articles can be formed that would apply to this argument. We only know in general that the use of both is not lessened of late.

The quantity of spirituous liquors distilled and imported is very greatly increased.

In 1685 duty was paid for	593,645	gallons distilled
- - - - -	1,414,614	ditto imported
In 1778 duty was paid for	2,954,000	gallons distilled.
- - - - -	2,102,000	ditto imported

Tea

Tea is now more generally consumed than even spirits among the lower ranks of people ; and there can be no doubt that it must interfere with the consumption of malt liquor, it supplies the place of the morning draught at least, and it is only in the use of the persons whose circumstances are very easy that it can be rated as a superfluity. The quantity consumed about the beginning of this century was very moderate. If we only take an account of what pays duty, the quantity consumed is now about six millions of pounds, but it is very well known that a large proportion both of the spirits and tea consumed pays no duty.

The account of the number of barrels charged with the excise duty in the two periods compared presents us with an increase upon the strong beer of 174,624, and a decrease upon the small of 607,653 That is upon the whole quantity strong and small 433,029, which is nearly a 1-15th. The increase of the strong beer certainly shews an increase of consumption, but the decrease of the small beer does not in like manner prove that the quantity consumed is diminished. DAVENANT has observed pag. 192, and the fact is certain, that the increase of the excise duty had given rise to a practice of brewing the liquor of an extraordinary strength to avoid the duty, and that liquor being afterwards reduced, the quantity is much greater than it appears from the charge. On this consideration

deration, it might fairly be argued that the quantity consumed is greater upon the whole by an increase of 174,624 barrels strong, notwithstanding the apparent decrease of the small beer charged. But in the above account there is a great fallacy, for an alteration took place in the collection duty, which greatly diminished the nominal quantity charged.

By an act of the 1st of King William c. 24. the brewers are entitled to an allowance of 1-10th upon every gage made upon the warm worts, and 34 gallons are allowed for the barrel of strong beer which before was rated only at 32 gallons, the barrel of small beer was at the same time reduced from 36 gallons, its former rate, to 34, the regulations as to the measure affected only the country brewery, the London brewery being already upon the same footing, but the allowance of 1-10th affected the whole.

The commissioners of excise in a memorial presented to the treasury on the 29th of March, 1696, while this measure was under consideration, compute the diminution of the duty that would take place upon account of the 1-10th allowance at 52,655 l. and upon the alteration of the measure 29,675 l.

DAVENANT indeed, in his Essay on the Management of the King's Revenues, vol. 1. 185, disputes the
the

the accuracy of this calculation, and allows the difference to be only 30,000 l. but, one object of that essay being to decry the conduct of the commissioners of excise, his observations must be received with some caution, and it is remarkable that he proves the accuracy of their calculation, in one respect, though he is not aware of the inference; for he says in p. 186, "The duty in London has decreased 1700 l. on a medium of 7 years; in the country on a like medium 155,592 l. why should the fall in London be but 1-10th of the general decrease and yet the duty in London be about 1-4th part of the whole excise." He proceeds then to account for this from mismanagement, whereas it is evident that the whole London brewery, being only affected by the 1-10th allowance, the decrease there ought to be no more than he states it.—He likewise states, that the duty fell in the first year after this regulation 60,653 l. But in truth upon a medium of several years the calculation of the commissioners is fully proved to be very moderate.

In order to form a fair comparison of the quantity of beer consumed during the two periods compared, the number of barrels charged before the year 1690 ought to be reduced to the present standard of allowance and measure.

The shortest method of finding the proportion that ought to be deducted on this account, will be,

be, to take the amount of the duty in these years, and deduct from it the amount of the diminution which took place in consequence of the alteration of the allowance.

DAVENANT p. 175 has given an account of the produce of the duty on beer and ale in each year from the year 1683 to the year 1696.

The average of six years from 1685 to 1689 both inclusive, omitting the fractions of a pound is 644,994l.

If we suppose the commissioners to be right in their calculation, which rates the probable diminution at 82,331l. the amount is nearly 1-9th, but taking it only at 60,653l. the decrease of the first year after the alteration took place it is more than 1-11th, or taking it even at 30,000l. the difference would greatly exceed the nominal decrease of 433,029 barrels, the duty on which at 6d. would only be 10825l. The real quantity of beer brewed for sale in the last period of 18 years must then exceed that which was brewed in the first period. If we take into consideration the increase of the private brewery, proved by the increase of the duties on malt and hops, and the great additional consumption of spirituous liquors and tea, there can remain no doubt, that as far as an increased consumption of articles of general and almost necessary use proves an increase of consumers, the
number

number of the people of England must be much greater now than at the time of the revolution.

It may be said however that an increase of consumption proves only that a greater degree of waste or intemperance prevails at one period than at another, and though the proceeding observations may be sufficient to refute Dr. PRICE's argument, they do not establish the contrary doctrine. An inquiry into other articles that are not the objects of any appetite, nor afford the means of intemperance will shew what weight there is in this objection.

The duty on leather took place in 1712. The amount of the first full year was 149,967 l. By a gradual increase, except whilst the distemper amongst the horned cattle prevailed, the duty has risen to 229,656 l. the amount of the year ending at Midsummer 1778.

The duty on candles took place in 1711, the first full year it produced 118,925 l. By a gradual rise that duty came to be in 1778, 205,776 l.

It was unnecessary to take any average of different periods for these duties, because they have been regularly advancing. One might add to this another circumstance, that the number of victualers has decreased from 47,343 the average for the years 1687, 1688, and 1689, to 31,814. The number of common brewers has at the same time increased

increased, though not in so great a proportion, but the quantity of beer now brewed by the common brewers is about $\frac{3}{4}$ ths of the whole, whereas the victuallers formerly brewed $\frac{3}{5}$ ths of the whole. The brewer cannot by law retail the beer in small quantities; the victualler does, and if there are fewer retailers, the inference seems pretty fair that the beer consumed at the publick house, bears a less proportion to that which is bought for domestick use than it did formerly. This is not offered as a very conclusive argument, nor would it have afforded matter of observation, if Dr. PRICE had not taken notice of the decrease of victuallers as arguing a decrease of consumption. The greater part of the consumption of leather and of candles is a matter of mere necessity; the increase upon these duties shews, that it would be unjust to ascribe to excess in living, the great increase of the quantity of liquors consumed; it may probably be true that more is consumed by an equal number of people now than at the time of the revolution, because they can better afford it, but the increase upon the various articles which are become matters of necessary use, is too considerable to be accounted for solely upon that reason.

F I N I S.

...of the whole, is too considerable to be accounted
for solely upon that reason.
...more is consumed by an equal number of people
now than at the time of the revolution, because
they can better afford it, but the increase upon the
various articles which are become matters of ne-
cessary use, is too considerable to be accounted
for solely upon that reason.
...of more necessity, and the more the goods
the more they are consumed, and the more the goods
in living, the more they are consumed, and the more the goods
more consumed; it may probably be true that
more is consumed by an equal number of people
now than at the time of the revolution, because
they can better afford it, but the increase upon the
various articles which are become matters of ne-
cessary use, is too considerable to be accounted
for solely upon that reason.